THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

THERE are some books in which one may take soundings anywhere, and judge them by the results of such a method. Any sample, taken from any part of the book, will give an accurate enough indication of the general character of the book. On the other hand, there are books which have to be read from the first word to the last, from beginning to end, before they can be properly evaluated. *The Death of Christ : The Cross in New Testament History and Faith*, by Professor John KNOX [1] falls very definitely into the latter of these two categories.

The book has three sections. In the first very brief section the historical events of the Crucifixion are summarily dealt with. In the second section Dr. KNOX deals with *Jesus and His Cross* ; and in the third section he discusses *The Cross in the Church*. If one reads only the first two sections of this book, one would say that it was an extremely radical book. We may begin by noting Dr. KNOX'S attitude to the historical value of Scripture. He asks the question : When the question of historical fact is asked about sayings attributed to Jesus in the Gospels, where does the burden of proof lie? ' Does it lie with those who doubt or with those who affirm ? Is it " up " to those who say that the so-called historical Jesus really made this or that disputed statement to show why they think so, or is it rather the responsibility of those who deny the authenticity (in this sense) of the saying to show cause ? ' Dr. KNOX has no doubt as to the answer to that question. The burden of proof lies with those who *accept* the sayings as historical and authentic, especially if these sayings are the kind of sayings which the Church might be expected to think out for itself. It is quite obvious that any book written on such presuppositions will not see the need in any way to anchor its conclusions to any statement made by Jesus in the Gospels ; and it is equally clear that all judgments in such a book will, to say the least, run the danger of being essentially subjective.

Take Dr. KNOX'S summation of what can be known about the Crucifixion : ' There can be no doubt whatever, of course, that Jesus was put to death by crucifixion—on this all our sources, including Paul, agree—and this datum may almost be said to belong essentially to the Church's memory of Jesus Himself. One can be almost equally sure that the Crucifixion took place in or near Jerusalem, in a Passover time, during the procuratorship of Pilate and by the hand of the Romans. But one cannot go beyond these formal facts with anything like the same assurance.' Dr. KNOX believes that three factors affected the Crucifixion story—the fact that it was dramatized by the early preachers, the fact that it is written to play down the part the Romans played, and the fact that it deliberately discounts the political significance of the death of Jesus.

We shall then be prepared for a very free treatment of the material when Dr. KNOX reaches the second section of his book—and we get it. Dr. KNOX does not think that Jesus ever thought of Himself in terms of the Servant-Messiah. He does not think that Jesus thought of Himself in terms of the Enochian Son of Man : ' Would it be psychologically possible for any sane person to think of himself either as the Enochian Son of man, or the Danielic Son of man ? ' He cannot believe that Jesus thought of Himself as the Messiah because, as J. W. Bowman puts it, ' of the great love for men that welled up within his own soul.' He cannot believe, as T. W. Manson puts it, that Jesus thought of Himself as, ' embodying in his own person the perfect human response to the regal claims of God.' ' A sane person, not to say a good person, just could not think of himself in such a way.' Dr. KNOX, in fact, denies that the Person who underwent the agony of Gethsemane

[1] Abingdon Press ; $2·75 net.

could have thought of Himself as the Servant-Messiah. He thinks that in the prophecies of Jesus' death there is a certain 'morbidity' of outlook; and he believes that we owe the prophecies of the suffering of the Son of Man to Mark's invention and not to Jesus Himself at all.

But the greatest thing about this book is that it does not stop there. In spite of everything it sees the Cross as the centre of everything, and as a tremendous act of God. Dr. KNOX brings under review the great classical theories of the Atonement. There is the idea of Christ as victor; there is the idea of Christ as sacrifice; and there is the moral influence theory. For the last he finds no evidence whatever in the New Testament. The first depends on a world view which we can no longer hold, for we no longer believe in demons. The second depends on a view of God we cannot hold, for it would mean that somehow God's hatred was turned into love by some kind of sacrifice. Does Dr. KNOX then discard these theories? Far from it—he regards them as essential. But they are not rational expressions of the Atonement; they are 'stories,' pictures of it. Man knows the need of liberation from the powers of evil; therefore, Christ is victory. Man knows the need of cleansing from his terrible sin in the sight of the Holy God; therefore, Christ is sacrifice. The Cross does more than demonstrate the love of God; it pours the love of God into our hearts. Dr. KNOX cannot think that these pictures and 'stories' can ever be replaced. They do not explain the Cross, but they do tell what the Cross does.

Dr. KNOX has a noble chapter on *The Cross and the Christian Way*. We can deny the Cross, because we cannot face a world in which innocence suffers. We can acknowledge the Cross and its suffering of innocence, and go on to deduce that life is like that, and, therefore, life is meaningless. We can accept the Cross and find in it the clue to the deepest meanings in life, the truth that somehow or other suffering *is* redemptive and suffering does lead to God.

Finally, Dr. KNOX sees two things in the Cross. In the Cross the love of God is poured into the hearts of men. Such a love lays on us the greatest of *obligations*, and such a love brings to us the greatest of *hopes*. 'What God has begun in us, He will surely finish.'

This is a strange book, but a great book. There can be few books which have so combined the astringency of the most uncompromising intellectual honesty, and the flame of undying devotion. There are those who will lift up their hands in horror at this book, and there are those who, if they have the courage to think it out, will be devoutly grateful for it.

Readers of this journal cannot fail to be interested in four questions about Biblical theology in an article which appears in the Winter 1957–58 issue of the American quarterly, *Religion in Life*.[1]

Dr. KING begins by remarking that Biblical theology is almost as vague a term as Liberalism. Nevertheless it may properly be used to represent a general tendency among contemporary Biblical scholars—a tendency marked by a refusal to judge the Bible from a viewpoint external to itself, a willingness to let the Bible speak for itself in its own terms, an assertion that the Biblical view of faith and life is both unique and definitive for Christians, over against pagan and modern views of religion and morality. Here are the four questions.

(1) *Is the Bible a Unity?* Biblical theologians stress the unity of the Bible, understanding this unity in a dynamic way as seen in the unfolding meaning of God's covenant and revelation to Israel. As a protest against the complete atomism of some types of historical criticism which seem to suggest a series of different religions in the Bible, this emphasis is justified; but there is a contrary danger that Biblical theology should play down the real differences in the Bible and affect to see a greater unity than is there. It is really impossible to identify the religion of Ecclesiastes, which insists that man is mortal as the beasts, with that of One who says, 'Because I live, you shall live also.' Can one speak of *the* Biblical viewpoint or teaching without evoking the justifiable retort: *Which*?

(2) *Is there 'Progressive Revelation' in the Bible?* The term progressive revelation is commonly repudiated by Biblical theologians as part of that evolutionary Liberalism which is now out-moded. Nevertheless the Biblical theologian, being a well-informed scholar, cannot but notice that it is a far cry from Joshua, claiming to serve God by liquidating his people's enemies, to Jesus telling His followers to love their enemies. How are such differences to be explained if progressive revelation is ruled out? The fact is that though the Biblical

[1] *Some Ambiguities in Biblical Theology*, by Dr. Winston L. King, Professor of Philosophy and Religion at Grinnell College, Iowa.

theologians avoid the name they cannot do without the conception. Thus in Dr. KING'S imagery the erring daughter Progressive Revelation, who has been publicly cast out of the front door of Orthodoxia as pregnant with man-made error, is later brought in by the servants' entrance under the guise of 'deeper insight' or 'higher understanding' of God's will and of how men should serve Him.

(3) *Can Biblical Fact be distinguished from Poetry and Biblical History from its Interpretation?* Dr. KING'S complaint here is that some Biblical theologians blur distinctions which are already difficult. On the one hand they affirm that Judeo-Christianity is historically grounded and finds its revelation in historical events. On the other hand, when it comes to events which the Bible presents as historical events—the burning bush, the thunders of Sinai, the resurrection and ascension of Jesus—their tendency is to spiritualise the seemingly objective fact and to say, for example, that Moses was called but the burning bush is a figure of speech, since the Hebraic mind makes no sharp distinction between the world of fact and the world of imagination. It is, of course, true that history must be written from a specific viewpoint which provides the clue to the angle of presentation as well as to the inclusion of some facts and the exclusion of others. That, however, is very different from alleging that there is no difference at all between fact and imaginative reconstruction or between history and interpretation. From a strictly Biblical point of view is not spiritualising just as objectionable as rationalising? One must press the question, too, whether historical events happen in a physically perceptible way in a space-time context as well as in finite human minds, or do they happen in the latter only?

Biblical theologians too often seem to try to have their cake—an established historical scheme of revelatory acts—and to swallow it, too, in a kind of mystification which prevents critics of the historical accuracy of the scheme from getting at it. Or shall we say that they use the term historical in a double sense? When historical events are doubtful, then historical means sacred or belonging to the realm of alleged events which are readily susceptible of being spiritualised or theologically interpreted. Whether the event ever occurred, save in the minds of the faithful, is unimportant. At other times, however, lest the whole of revelation should be dissolved into mystical mythology, the event is roundly asserted to be historical in the ordinary sense of the term. No doubt we must reckon with the fact that the Oriental mind is less prosaic than ours, that there is much poetry in the Bible and that the prophets and our Lord used highly symbolic ways of speaking; but if we go to the extreme of holding that fact and poetry, history and interpretation are one and indistinguishable in the Bible, then how do we know that there was an Exodus, a Covenant, or even a consecutive history?

(4) *Does God's Moral Character Change?* This is the aspect of the matter which troubles Dr. KING most, for he seems to hear echoes of that fundamentalism which would assert that God did every thing that the Bible says He did, and yet that He has been and is unchangingly holy and good. If we are going to let the Bible speak on this matter of the moral character of God we seem to be shut up either to the view that God has changed or that man's ideas of Him have progressed. Biblical theologians will not admit either pattern of thought, Who then is this God of theirs? What is His will?

Admitting it to be true that religion is more than morality and that all sorts of relativities enter into ethical standards, we cannot allow that religion is less than moral, according to the best contemporary standards, and so render significant conversation with the good pagan impossible. The Hebrew prophets did not, indeed, work out a systematic definition of justice, but their categories of judgment still have meaning for us, because they spoke to human situations consonant with much of our moral experience and we can commend their message to our non-religious contemporaries.

We have sought to present our author's case without mention of his specific criticism of one or two contemporary Biblical theologians, because, details apart, the questions he asks are important. For ourselves we should be inclined to add one other question—are Biblical theologians sufficiently on their guard against the oldest and most persistent way of finding a unity in the Bible, the way of allegorizing? Further, we note two dangers in the strong assertion of revelation in history accompanied by confusion of historical fact and interpretation. It gives the impression that the Biblical theologian is tossing with a double-headed coin, and it leads to an agnosticism which takes all Biblical history so-called as purely symbolic, the shapeless shadow cast by an unknown God or even the fantasies of the collective human unconscious. Finally, when confronted with these difficult passages in the Bible we feel inclined to approach them by asking with Professor Leonard Hodgson, What must the truth have been and be if men who thought and spoke as they did put it like that?

Devotional and Pastoral Classics

The Confessions of S. Augustine

By the Reverend Canon Lionel du Toit, M.A., Vicar of S. Mary's, Windermere

'The greatest figure of the patristic age, and incomparably the most powerful influence upon the history of Western religion during the thousand years which followed his death' (Burnaby). 'Incomparably the greatest man between Paul the Apostle and Luther the Reformer' (Harnack). 'It seems indisputable that, whether Augustine be the greatest Latin writer or not, he is the greatest man who ever wrote Latin' (Souter). It seems to be inevitable that, from whatever point of view men speak of S. Augustine, they instinctively fall into the use of superlatives. Whatever may be thought about the effects of his teaching in certain directions, no one has ever doubted the stupendous weight of his influence. Here is a giant among men; one of the formative minds in the history of the world. And he has left us a book about himself which stands out as one of the world's greatest books. 'The most famous of Christian spiritual writings outside the New Testament,' says Dom R. Hudleston, in his preface to a newly published English translation of *The Confessions*.

The book was written just before A.D. 400, when Augustine was Bishop of Hippo, and it embodies his mature reflection on the significance of his early life from infancy to the time of his conversion in A.D. 386. Some vigorous attempts have been made, on the basis of his extant writings contemporary with the date of the conversion, to impugn the historical accuracy of *The Confessions*. But generally speaking the verdict on these attempts seems to be, 'Not proven'; and *The Confessions* remains the best interpretation of S. Augustine's mind.

'Great art thou, O Lord, and greatly to be praised; great is thy power and thy wisdom infinite. . . . Thou awakest us to delight in thy praise; for thou hast made us for thyself, and our heart is restless until it rest in thee.' The opening sentence of *The Confessions* is like the opening phrase of a great fugue, to be developed under many variations, but always remaining the underlying theme of the whole work. For those who love the book that great sentence has a magical power. Like the opening lines of a favourite play of Shakespeare it carries into the mind by anticipation all the glory that is to follow. The note of praise is struck from the beginning: the book is to be primarily a confession of praise to God. It is important that the title should not mislead the reader into thinking of the book as primarily intended to be a confession of sin, or even as merely the self-revelation of the writer's life and mind. Indeed it is a mistake to try to fit *The Confessions* into any strictly defined genre of literature. It is not autobiography. Augustine makes no attempt to give an exhaustive account of the events of that part of his life about which the book treats. It is like the Bible in this that the final impression that it leaves with us is that the real subject of the book has not been man but God. In some ways it recalls to the mind the spirit and tone of Ps 119. It is a soliloquy addressed to God and overheard by man: 'I speak to thy mercy, not to scornful man.' It is this direction of the whole book to God that gives to it its transparent sincerity. In spite of being written about the intimate actions and thoughts of the writer's own life, the book is free from all impression of egotism. There is no placing the soul upon the stage, no self-posturing before the eyes of man. It is saved from these dangers by an overmastering sense of the reality and the presence of God. It is the sense of God pervading the whole which has made this strange work in semi-biographical form into one of the greatest—perhaps the greatest of all—devotional classics.

The Confessions is remarkable among all other devotional writings in bearing the impress of a mind of gigantic power. This places the book in a class of its own. *The Devout Life* of S. Francis of Sales, or *The Imitation of Christ*, lovely and loveable though their authors are, display neither the intellectual power nor the contact with the rough and tumble of ordinary life that are so evident in *The Confessions*. S. Augustine's cast of mind is such, that both his thought and his spirituality spring directly out of concrete everyday life. Incurable though he is in his intellectual probing,

his mind is always set in motion by some concrete happening. His thought is not presented to us in the form of dogmatic or theological statements: rather it is hurled down in white-hot fragments from the totality of his living experience. Life and thought, experience and theological expression, are fused together. For Augustine it is in the world of men that God is found and followed. Religion for him is full blooded. We feel about him, more than is the case with any other spiritual writer, that the saint is living in our own world.

Augustine wrote *The Confessions* fifteen hundred years before the scientific study of psychology began. Nevertheless, he shows extraordinary psychological insight, and his book is a rich source for psychological study. In it he works out a theory of volition, and in discussing 'the fields and spacious palaces of memory' he even adumbrates a theory of the sub-conscious mind: 'we have not utterly forgotten that which we remember ourselves to have forgotten. That which we have utterly forgotten, though lost, we cannot even seek after.' In education he advocates the motive of 'free curiosity' as of more efficiency than 'frightful enforcement.' Speaking of determinism in a phrase which might well serve as a warning to certain tendencies in the psychology of our own day, he says: 'How much do they endeavour to strike at the roots of a man's soul when they say, "The course of thy sinning is inevitably ordained by heaven".' Penetrating insight into human motive is one of the distinguishing features of the book. He discovers himself showing his most heated indignation against those sins to which he personally was most drawn: 'What sin, when I detected it, did I criticize so fiercely as that which I was myself doing to others?' How near he seems to be to common experience when, speaking of his youthful escapades, he says: 'I made myself out to be worse than I was—*that I might not be dispraised.*' He remarks how large an influence personal liking and disliking plays in men's reception of truth: speaking of Ambrose he says, 'I began to love him at first, not as a teacher of truth, but as a man kind to myself.' He shows himself alive to the effect of crowd psychology on the individual will: remarking on the change that had come over his friend Alypius who had been dragged wholly against his will into a gladiatorial show, but found himself swept away into frenzy by the crowd, Augustine writes, 'nor was he now the man he came, but one of the crowd he came into.' Finally, how much deeper than Pelagius had he penetrated into the springs of human action, who could write, 'What man is there who, weighing his own infirmity, dares to ascribe his purity and innocency to his own strength?'

The Confessions is a book full of interest at whatever level you approach it. As a contemporary account of daily life and thought in the Roman world of the fourth century it is of priceless value. This is how men and women were living and thinking then: these were some of their problems; and these the answers they were being given. The contemporary scene becomes very living indeed in S. Augustine's pages. But, interesting as it must always remain to the historian, it is as a supreme example of the pilgrimage of the human soul to God—a veritable 'Pilgrims' Progress'—that the book will chiefly be read. 'I lost myself in a multiplicity of things.' But the Hound of Heaven is always in pursuit. 'All the time that I was wandering through the broad ways of the world, thou didst not forsake me.' Augustine was born of a pagan father and a Christian mother, at a time when Paganism still remained a living option as against Christ. This inevitably led to severe conflict in the boy's life. But Paganism never seems to have attracted him. Perhaps he was too much his mother's son for that. That 'the name of Christ was not in it' was enough to make any system insipid to him. What attracted him at first was the strange Christian deviation of Manichæism, because it seemed to him to avoid certain difficulties of the Catholic faith. But his mind was too good to be permanently satisfied by any diluted form of Christianity. And so, though he remained a Manichee for nine years, he was gradually brought (first through the influence of Neoplatonism, and then through contact with Ambrose) to a whole-hearted acceptance of the Catholic faith. Throughout the period S. Augustine had not, as is sometimes thought, led a thoroughly dissolute moral life. For thirteen years he had lived faithful to the mother of his child, in a relationship, outside indeed of legal marriage, but one which was generally accepted as thoroughly respectable by the pagan society of his time.

The account of his conversion is inimitably written and is the climax of the whole book. He was in 'a little garden' with his friend Alypius, tortured by conflict between Christ and the flesh. A book lay open on the seat. He heard from a neighbouring house a child's voice repeating many times the words, 'Take it up and read.' He returned to the seat, took up the book, and his eyes fell on the verse; 'Not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying. But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh.' 'No further would I read; nor needed I: for instantly at the end of the sentence, by a light as it were of serenity infused into my heart, all the darkness of doubt vanished away.' It was an experience such as, over thirteen hundred

years later, befell John Wesley in the room in Aldersgate Street when 'his heart was strangely warmed.' And in both cases it was the Epistle to the Romans that was being read.

It was said by John Bright of Gladstone's oratory that he seldom sailed boldly from headland to headland; that he preferred to hug the coast and follow to its source any navigable river which he encountered during his voyage. This is precisely true of S. Augustine, who, incidentally was alleged by Gladstone to be one of the teachers to whom he owed most. Even in the midst of the breathless account of his conversion he holds up the narrative by several long paragraphs on the freedom of the will. The facts of his own life are only interesting to him in so far as he can 'follow them to the source,' and find in them generally significant principles. Thus, his boyish escapade of robbing the pear tree is followed by a general inquiry into the motives of temptation and sin: the meeting with the drunken beggar leads up to a disquisition on the true joy. His mind is continually probing beneath the surface.

There are, as always in S. Augustine's writings, many phrases which stand out unforgettably in the memory: 'I am the food of grown men: grow, and thou shalt feed on me': 'Blessed is he who loveth Thee, and his friend in Thee, and his enemy for Thee.' 'There He is where truth is loved.' 'Love God, and do what you will'—a phrase that so angered Pelagius. But it is not as a collection of beautiful sayings, which illuminate great tracts of Christian experience, that the book is chiefly to be read. Rather it is to be read for the total impression that it makes upon the mind. Here man is seen placed against the background of eternity, and of the overmastering reality of God. We are left with the certainty that we derive our value and significance from God alone.

The reader of *The Confessions*, however, must be prepared for some things that are distasteful to him, and it would be the greatest pity if he were to be turned against the book as a whole because of some inequalities that are specially jarring to a twentieth century mind. There are things which S. Augustine seems to have got seriously out of proportion. 'So small a boy, and so great a sinner,' seems a trifle hard to be the last word on the escapade of the stealing of the pears. And his depreciating references to literature (chiefly Vergil) look negative and ungenerous beside the glad acceptance of all this side of human culture by Dante. It is difficult to see why he did not regularize the relationship with the mother of his child. His failure to do so may have had something to do with his own mother: moreover, the state of celibacy was, in Christian circles, coming to be regarded as the higher ideal. But behind these outward pressures there is apparent, in Augustine himself, an attitude towards sex which is not stable. His general attitude towards the subject, though formally orthodox, has had a harmful effect on Christian thought and has discouraged the working out in theology of a positive attitude towards sex as a Divine means of grace.

It must never be forgotten that S. Augustine was an African. He was also a man in whom an abnormally passionate nature was combined with an abnormally active intelligence. Added to this he was never quite able to shake off the effects of his training in rhetoric which combined with his own temperament to lead at times to overstatement and a certain turgidity of style. But while all those things have left their mark, the really surprising thing is the extent to which he has survived their perils.

It was said of Baron von Hügel by one who knew him well that, when in conversation he spoke the word 'God,' he filled it with such depth of meaning that a sense of the reality of God seemed to come alive in those who were with him. That is precisely the impression that *The Confessions* of S. Augustine makes on me. It brings thegreat ness and reality of God to me in an overmastering way. It is so different from all other devotional books both in form and matter, and yet it is so full of God. It will never yield its secrets to any one who is not prepared to live with it and in it. Those who, in some measure, have tried to do this, will re-echo Gladstone's judgment in their own experience when he said that S. Augustine was one of the three or four teachers to whom he owed the most.

The Gospel of Truth

The Editio Princeps of an Ancient Gnostic Text

By the Reverend C. K. Barrett, D.D., The University of Durham

The circumstances in which the document we are about to describe was discovered are by no means certainly known. It was apparently in 1945 that peasants, digging in the neighbourhood of Nag Hammadi in Upper Egypt, in the ruins of an ancient cemetery and near the site of the first monasteries founded by Pachomius in the fourth century, unearthed, and broke, a large jar. There fell out a number of ancient but well-preserved Coptic MSS.; the jar may once have constituted the library of a gnostic sect or community. The history of these MSS. before their accidental discovery is naturally a matter for learned investigation; unfortunately their subsequent history also is obscure, but it now appears that, of thirteen MSS. originally discovered, twelve have found their way to the Coptic Museum at Cairo. For the publication of these twelve MSS. we are still waiting.[1] The thirteenth MS. came eventually into the possession of the Jung Institute at Zürich, and is for this reason often referred to as the Jung Codex. It is, perhaps, fortunate that this should have been the volume to be separated from its fellows, for those who have seen it, and are best informed about the other MSS., are of the opinion that it differs in several respects from the rest, and stands apart from them as requiring separate treatment.

The Jung Codex, which has for some time been accessible to distinguished European scholars, has already been described and discussed in public. Special reference must be made to a volume, edited and translated into English by Dr. F. L. Cross, and consisting of contributions from H. C. Puech, G. Quispel, and W. C. van Unnik.[2] This is a pioneer work of fundamental importance. Much in it is rightly expressed in a tentative fashion, and some judgments may eventually have to be revised; but the three authors have raised effectively the questions posed by the document which they had the privilege of seeing. This article is much indebted to them.

Since the publication of Dr. Cross's volume a very important further step has been taken. Not the whole, but a very significant part of the Jung Codex (which contains altogether five works[3]) has now been published, and so far at least as this part is concerned the discussion is open to all. The material we now have before us, published under the title *Evangelium Veritatis*,[4] is found on the folios of the Jung Codex numbered 8 (verso) to 22 (recto), that is, from p. 16 to p. 43. Unfortunately, folios 17 and 18 (pp. 33 to 36) are wanting. The publication is sumptuous; and deplorably expensive. After a short Introduction (eight pages) by the three editors, follow twenty-four plates containing photographic copies of twenty-four pages of the MS. Next the Coptic text is transcribed, on the left-hand pages, with a French translation facing it. Ten pages of 'Notes Critiques' follow, then a German, and finally an English translation. There are Indices of Greek and of Coptic words. The photographs are very well executed; the transcription wherever I have checked it with the plates is accurate; the French translation is a work of scholarship which constitutes an important and valuable contribution to our understanding of the document. Unfortunately it is scarcely possible to say so much for the English, which not only is somewhat clumsy, and at times less clear than the original, but also gives sometimes the impression of being a translation not of Coptic but of French. How else can one account for the curious forms 'Gnose' (which is good French, though English would have 'Gnosis'), and 'Verb' (which does not mean 'the part of speech which asserts or predicates something,' but transliterates *Verbe*, a proper translation of *sheje*)? These defects are regrettable, but the student cannot complain that he has not been given all he needs in order to pursue serious study of the text. He has, in fact, been given a great deal of valuable assistance.

[1] There seems to be reason to hope that another Nag Hammadi text, *The Gospel of Thomas*, may be published shortly. See G. Garitte, *Le Muséon*, lxx. [1957], 60; W. Till, *Bulletin of the Rylands Library*, xl. [1957], 252, n. 6; G. Quispel, *Vigiliae Christianae*, xi. [1957], 189 (note).

[2] *The Jung Codex*: Three Studies by H. C. Puech, G. Quispel, and W. C. van Unnik, tr. and ed. by F. L. Cross [1955].

[3] 'Letter of James,' 'Gospel of Truth,' 'Letter to Rheginos,' 'Treatise on the Three Natures,' 'Prayer of the Apostles.'

[4] Ediderunt M. Malinine, H. C. Puech, and G. Quispel; Studien aus dem C. G. Jung—Institut VI.; Rascher Verlag, Zürich [1956].

Let us take up the document thus laid before us. The book is a papyrus codex,[1] approximately twice as tall as it is wide (29 cm. × 14 cm.). The codex as a whole now contains about a hundred pages; it is certain that originally it contained more. It is written in a plain, clear, unornamented script, in which it is possible to detect several hands. The editors are not disposed to be dogmatic about its date; we have in fact no large amount of Coptic writing which provides a really suitable comparison. They are, however, inclined 'to date the codex in the middle of the fourth century,' with the wider limits that 'it cannot be earlier than the second quarter of the fourth century, or later than the end of the same century' (p. x).

Notwithstanding a few traces of other dialects, the MS. is written in a fairly pure form of the Subakhmimic dialect of Coptic, and on linguistic grounds it may be judged to have originated in the area of Assiout, north of Akhmim.

What of the contents of the *Evangelium Veritatis*? It is hopelessly unsystematic, and very difficult to summarize, since it does not proceed in an orderly fashion from point to point. In what follows, however, an attempt is made to represent the main themes in the order in which they appear.

The work begins with the proclamation that the Gospel of Truth means joy for all who by means of it come to know the Saviour, and then turns back to describe what may be called the presuppositions of salvation. Ignorance concerning the Father produced anguish and terror. Error elaborated matter (ὕλη) and modelled it, trying to make in beauty an equivalent of truth (of which naturally it was ignorant). Thus, and by means of oblivions and terrors, Error set out to imprison 'those of the centre'—that is, presumably, those who stood between mind and matter.

The opposite of oblivion is Knowledge (Gnosis) through which men know the Father. This Knowledge God revealed, in the hidden mystery of Jesus Christ, to the perfect; this act of revelation *is* the Gospel. Because Jesus brought this Gnosis, Error was angry with Him, and nailed Him to a wood (tree), so that He became a fruit of the Gnosis of the Father. Those who ate this fruit He made joyful; He was a guide. 'In the midst of a school he appeared and proclaimed the Word, even as a Master' (19^{18-20}). He confounded those who were sages in their own eyes, and incurred their hatred. But then came the little children, to whom belongs the Gnosis of the Father. To them was given the book, which only He who was to be sacrificed could take.

For this reason Jesus suffered patiently, knowing 'that his death meant life for many' ($20^{13f.}$).

[1] Like the other Nag Hammadi MSS.

When He was nailed to the wood He attached the deed of disposition (?—διάταγμα) of the Father to the Cross. Though immortal, He entered the terror, and placed Himself at the head of those who had been stripped by oblivion, and thus became Gnosis and perfection. All must re-ascend to the Father, but only they can receive this teaching who are in the book of the living. He who remains ignorant to the end is a creature of oblivion, and with oblivion he will be destroyed. But if any one has the Gnosis he is a 'being from on high' (22^{4}). They are like a man who has been drunk, and becomes sober.

The Gnosis was revealed to the eons, and with it were associated the emanations. These are (apparently), God's wisdom, word, intelligence, gnosis, joy, glory, love, and faith. The Gnosis purifies the All, and causes it to return to 'the Father and to the Mother, Jesus of infinite gentleness' ($24^{7f.}$). By revealing Himself, the Father abolishes form (σχῆμα), which is the world (κόσμος); the goal of the process is unity.

The word, like a two-edged sword, effects judgment. It was not only a sound, but also took on a body (σῶμα). When this happened, error was agitated, and the eons received the revelation. All spaces come forth from the Father, but at first they have neither form (μορφή) nor name. Form they receive from Gnosis. Till then they are like an event (καιρός) that is still to happen; God alone has knowledge of what will be. Man without knowledge is as it were in a bad dream; like day light, knowledge of the Father brings relief.

Joy to the man who has thus re-discovered himself! This happens through the Spirit and the Gnosis. The beloved Son appeared to instruct men about the Father. Men could touch Him, 'for he came in a similitude of flesh' ($31^{4f.}$). He was the Revealer, the Shepherd who abandoned the ninety-nine sheep for the one that strayed.

(At this point comes the hiatus caused by the loss of folios 17, 18).

God's words were in the depth of His mind. Logos was the first to come forth, according to God's will, which is incomprehensible; but the end of the process is knowledge of the Father. The *name* of the Father is the Son, through whom the Father reveals Himself; yet, though the name was produced before the eons, the Son came into being. The Father sent the Son to speak about His place, and to glorify the pleroma; thus men participate in God's face through embraces. Absolutely good, unshakeable, mild, knowing all the spaces, having no need of instruction: this is the manner of existence of those who are related to the Divine. They do not descend into Hades. They do not search for truth; they are truth. The Father is in them, and they are in the Father.

God's children are perfect, and worthy of His name.

So far we have been content to describe the document whose contents have now been summarized as 'The Gospel of Truth.' This title is drawn from the first line of the MS., but probably has further significance. Irenaeus, to whom we are indebted for much of our information about the gnostic sects of the second century, was aware that the Valentinians possessed a work which they called 'The Gospel of Truth.' His words are [1]:

> Those who are from Valentinus, being . . . altogether reckless, while they put forth their own compositions, boast that they possess more gospels than there really are. Indeed, they have arrived at such a pitch of audacity, as to entitle their comparatively recent writing 'the Gospel of Truth,' though it agrees in nothing with the Gospels of the Apostles, so that they have really no Gospel which is not full of blasphemy.[2]

There was no reason to doubt that the work had once existed, though, up to the present, it had remained entirely unknown; there seems to-day to be little reason to doubt that the Valentinian 'Gospel of Truth' is now before us in the Jung Codex. The thought corresponds with what is known of Valentinianism; there is nothing to suggest a date of composition later than the second century.

Dr. van Unnik has (with proper caution) gone further in proposing a more precise account of the origin of 'The Gospel of Truth.' He notes that though 'The Gospel of Truth' is gnostic, and indeed Valentinian, its Valentinianism has not been taken far, and its 'Gnosticism' is of a comparatively innocent kind. He suggests that the work 'was written by Valentinus at Rome round about 140–145, before the development of the typically gnostic dogmas' (*The Jung Codex*, 104), and at the time of Valentinus's unsuccessful attempt to become Bishop of Rome. While I should wish to share Dr. van Unnik's caution, and to regard his hypothesis as tentative, I am bound to add that, within these limits, it appears to me convincing.

There remains space only to sketch some of the other important questions raised by 'The Gospel of Truth.' It cannot be underlined too heavily that first-hand documents of second-century Gnosticism are very scarce. Hitherto, the history of Christian Gnosticism has been written by its enemies (from Irenaeus, Hippolytus, and Tertullian onwards). The publication of the whole Nag Hammadi collection (when this takes place) will do much to enable us to see Gnosticism through gnostic eyes; and already 'The Gospel of Truth' has made possible a step in this direction—a step, that is, in the understanding of second-century Christianity.[3]

In the first place, if our document is rightly identified with the Valentinian 'Gospel of Truth,' we gain new light on the theological character of Valentinianism. At least in its earlier stages, speculation about the procession of the eons played a smaller part than has generally been supposed, and Valentinianism was more 'Christian' than most of its adversaries would like us to think. According to Hippolytus (vi. 16 [21]), Valentinus derived his system from Pythagoras and Plato; but if we are to judge from 'The Gospel of Truth' he derived it from the New Testament. He is awed by the wonder of redemption in Christ; he knows that the Son gave Himself up to death that men might live, entering the realm of death and terror that He might lead out those who were bound there. Some of his expressions have an unfamiliar ring, but they are not for that reason unorthodox.

This observation leads to two further questions. If this comparatively innocent system is the primitive form of a gnostic heresy, whence came Christian Gnosticism? And, secondly, what further impulse led to the development of the features of mature Gnosticism?

The question whether there was a pre-Christian Gnosticism, and if so what it was like, is so complex that it would be futile to attempt to examine it here. Dr. Quispel [4] combats the belief that there existed a pre-Christian Iranian myth of a gnostic redeemer; in this he may well be right. But to say this is not to deny that there was Gnosticism, or even a gnostic myth of redemption, before Christianity. Dr. Quispel says, 'In so far as Gnosis is pre-Christian, it goes back to heterodox Jewish conceptions, *e.g.*, about Adam and the Name and to the pre-Asiatic syncretism in general. In its origins Gnosis is Jewish-Near-Eastern occultism, Oriental mysticism' (p. 78). But we are still compelled to ask how this heterodox Judaism, with its speculations about Adam and the Name, arose. It is clear from 'The Gospel of Truth' itself that an influence was at work which developed what the New Testament means by the knowledge of God (and the profounder New Testament conception that what really matters is being known by God—1 Co 13^{12}, Gal 4^{9}) into a doctrine of Gnosis comparable with that of the Hermetica.

In answer to the second question it might be

[1] *Adv. Haereses*, III. xi. 9; translation from Ante-Nicene Christian Library.

[2] See also Pseudo-Tertullian, *Adv. omnes Haereses*, 4: *Evangelium habet* [*Valentinus*] *etiam suum praeter haec nostra.*

[3] For it would be wrong to suppose that all the Nag Hammadi documents are gnostic in a heretical sense; see W. C. van Unnik on the *Apocryphon Jacobi* in *Vigiliae Christianae* X. [1956] 149–156.

[4] *The Jung Codex*, 76 ff.

observed that though developed Valentinianism is different from the doctrine of 'The Gospel of Truth' it is not a *metabasis eis allo genos*. Already in 'The Gospel of Truth' there are eons, and already behind 'The Gospel of Truth' may be discerned the quasi-rationalistic spirit which seeks to describe the indescribable and explain the inexplicable; or rather, perhaps, to tell the truth about the origin of the universe in mythological form. It will be noted also that 'The Gospel of Truth' is very concerned about knowledge and life, but not about the forgiveness of sins.

One more question may be raised—that of the relation of 'The Gospel of Truth' to the New Testament. Allusions to New Testament books are very common, and suggest that at least the following books were in use: Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, (Acts), Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1 Thessalonians, 1 Timothy, Hebrews, (1 and 2 Peter), (1 John), Revelation.[1] It must not be concluded that these works formed, for Valentinus, a canon in the strict sense of the word; but it is interesting and important to note that a Christian (even though incipiently heretical) used them all in the middle of the second century; and that his (gnostic) Gospel was undoubtedly secondary to the New Testament.

More detailed study of 'The Gospel of Truth' will undoubtedly produce more conclusions of great value; we must wait as patiently as we can for the publication of the rest of the Jung Codex, and of the other twelve Nag Hammadi MSS.

[1] I use for convenience the list given by Dr. van Unnik (*The Jung Codex*, 115–121). I should be inclined to omit a few of his references and to add others, without substantial difference.

Literature

THE PERSON OF CHRIST

The name of Vincent Taylor is apt to suggest to many of us the most redoubtable champion of the Proto-Luke hypothesis or the author of the most judicious account in English of Form-Criticism. But, in recent years, while abating nothing of his interest in criticism of this kind, he has been steadily winning fresh laurels as a theologian. His first trilogy of this kind was devoted to the work of Christ; in the second (which represents his Oxford Speaker's Lectures) he has been concerned with the Person of Christ. 'The Names of Jesus' [1953] was followed by 'The Life and Ministry of Jesus' [1954]. Now *The Person of Christ in New Testament Teaching* (Macmillan; 21s. net) completes the second trilogy, and, we may add, the end crowns the work. When his monumental commentary on Mark appeared we were inclined to say, 'This is Vincent Taylor's *magnum opus*—his most enduring contribution to scholarship.' Now we are tempted to reserve the words for his latest book. Not for long have we read a more satisfying piece of theology.

It falls into two almost equal parts, each being about a hundred and fifty pages long. Part I is exegetical; Part II historical and theological. First, Dr. Taylor studies the books of the New Testament from the earliest Gospel to the Apocalypse in order to discover what conception of Christ's Person the various authors held. Where everything is done with rare competence, it is perhaps invidious to single out any single discussion; but the highlight of this Part seems to us to be the section on St. Paul's Christology. Here are two sentences from it: 'Paul will not compromise his belief that God is one God, not even for Christ's sake'; yet 'the ultimate implications of his theology are Trinitarian.' (There is a splendid chapter on the Christ Hymn in Ph 2; but why does Dr. Taylor not reckon with the possibility that *heauton ekenosen* echoes Is 53^{12}?) Hardly less admirable are the essays on the Christology of 1 Peter and Hebrews. This part of the book shows how markedly the categories of Lordship and Sonship dominate the New Testament teaching about Christ, a fact impressively confirmed by some statistical tables at the end.

Yet, for all the value of Part I, it is in Part II that Dr. Taylor comes to the height of his powers and writes with his greatest insight. The first two chapters here he devotes to a penetrating study of 'the Divine Consciousness of Jesus,' finding in His unique Sonship the key to His Person in the Gospels, and showing how that Sonship came through His knowledge of God as Father, 'mediated by prayer and communion with Him in a process of growth and development which begins before the opening of the historic ministry and was consummated by decisive experiences of revelation and intuition.' There follows a sketch of the Christology of the Primitive Church which exposes its two palmary limitations—a lack of close connexion between the Person and work of Christ, and the failure to integrate the doctrine about Christ into the doctrine of God. In order to overcome these limitations the great New Testament theologians pressed into service categories like

those of Wisdom and the Logos. With the next chapters we pass from Biblical to Systematic Theology. First, Dr. Taylor considers the Christology of the New Testament in relation to various theories of the Trinity, coming down finally in favour of 'the social theory' associated with the names of Clement Webb, L. S. Thornton and Leonard Hodgson. But if the Incarnation is really the Triune God's invasion of our human life, it must involve some kind of Divine self-limitation. In other words, the kenotic doctrine in some shape or form is inevitable. 'The truth is,' says Dr. Taylor, 'that we cannot get rid of kenoticism. If we dismiss it at the door, it comes back through the window.'

But have not the late Drs. Temple and Baillie damaged the kenosis conception beyond all theological repair? Unimpressed by their attack, Dr. Taylor proceeds to criticize the critics most effectively before electing for that improved kind of kenosis doctrine which we associate with H. R. Mackintosh and P. T. Forsyth. The Son of God, in becoming man, willed to renounce the exercise of His Divine prerogatives and powers so that in the course of His earthly existence He might live within the necessary limitations which belong to human finitude. These Divine powers were laid aside not in the sense that they were abandoned but in the sense that they became latent through being no longer in use. Such a doctrine (and Dr. Taylor devotes his long last chapter to its defence) has three merits: it unequivocally accepts the divinity of Christ: it preserves the unity of His Divine-human Person: and it sets the Incarnation within the context of eternal love and sacrifice.

A further chapter, entitled 'Christology and Psychology,' glances at William Sanday's famous attempt to locate the Divine nature of Christ in His subconscious. Many have regarded this as a kind of theological mare's nest which were better forgotten. Dr. Taylor, however, regards it as a commendable failure, suggesting that the locus of His divinity would be better sought in Christ's conscious life with its decisive experiences of revelation, while not forgetting that His unconscious life must have been invaded also by Divine grace and power. An Epilogue reminds us that 'we do not first discover who Christ is and then believe in Him; we believe in Him and then discover who He is.' For faith alone knows who Jesus is.

We have no hesitation in pronouncing this the maturest of all Dr. Taylor's books. Immensely learned, it is well planned, well argued, and well written. It abounds with apt quotations; it shows on every page the balanced judgment we expect from him; and ever and anon we light on something striking and memorable. Take this on Christ's Sonship: 'In the Synoptic Gospels the Sonship of Christ stands out like the tall crests on a relief map; in the Fourth Gospel it appears continually like high points on a broad plateau.' Or this comment on the Christology of Hebrews: 'It is abundantly clear that without a full use of the idea of Divine love (Hebrews has only one reference) all attempts to present the doctrine of Christ's Person must fail.'

We have said enough to indicate the quality of this book. For every student of the New Testament it is a 'Must.' Its scholarship, its clarity, its honesty and its reverent plumbing of the ineffable mysteries serve to underline anew our indebtedness to this great Methodist scholar. A. M. HUNTER

THE BURNING BUSH

The late Professor G. D. Henderson of Aberdeen had established himself as the outstanding exponent in our day of the history and character of Presbyterianism. Keen anticipation therefore was aroused when it became known that before his sudden death during the sittings of last General Assembly he had gathered together in one volume a number of his studies in Scottish Church history. That volume is now before us—*The Burning Bush*—published by the Saint Andrew Press at 30s. net. It consists of sixteen substantial chapters, of which fourteen have appeared before in one form or another. Of the two now published for the first time, one is a study of Alexander Gerard, whom Professor Henderson presents as a typical Moderate, whose main contributions to literature, despite his Chair of Divinity, were in the fields of philosophic, aesthetic and practical subjects. The other new study is that from which the volume takes its title. It is a characteristically thorough investigation of all that pertains to the emblem of the burning bush and to its use by the Church of Scotland. This authoritative discussion renders all previous conclusions on this subject out-of-date.

A perusal of this volume serves to emphasize the loss which historical scholarship has sustained by its author's passing. Patient investigation, leading to fullness of knowledge and then to compact yet clear statement, diversified at times by flashes of caustic comment—these were characteristic of the man, and he could use them to make the past illumine living issues in the Church to-day.

One must question the statement on p. 139 that the Evangelical party's influence amounted to dominance at the close of the eighteenth century. It was not till 1834 that that party could be said to dominate the General Assembly. There appears to be an error on p. 225, for it is surely of the late eighteenth century, not the late nineteenth, that it can be said that Scotland had six parallel Presbyterian bodies living 'mostly on terms of mutual

excommunication' ; and even that number is not accurate except for the years 1799 to 1806.

Grateful for what is now made available here, we cannot but regret that one so fully endowed was not spared to carry out some further studies which he had in mind, and to serve the Church of Scotland with his knowledge and counsel.

STEWART MECHIE

THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT

It might be thought that there is little new left to be said about the Sermon on the Mount ; but it is certainly true that *The Gospel from the Mount : A New Translation and Interpretation of Matthew chs. 5 to 7*, by Dr. John Wick Bowman and Dr. Roland W. Tapp (Westminster Press, Philadelphia ; $3.75) is full of new insights and new illumination. We gather that the main body of the work is from Dr. Bowman and that Dr. Tapp's main contribution to the book lies in the very scholarly and helpful notes, although the two writers worked in collaboration of thought all through the book.

This book has many notable excellences. Dr. Bowman holds that the introduction to the Sermon on the Mount really begins at Mt 4^{23}, a fact which the present chapter divisions obscure ; and that the Sermon on the Mount is to be read as the Gospel of the Kingdom which Jesus preached throughout all Galilee. Dr. Bowman's translations are uniformly stimulating. We take as a sample his translation of the first four beatitudes :

God's gift to you who know your own spiritual poverty—
the Kingdom of God is for you !

God's grace for you penitent—
you shall find forgiveness !

God's blessing on you serene—
you shall possess the land !

God's boon to you hungry and thirsty for righteousness—
you shall find satisfaction!

Or again, Mt 5^{22} :

I say to you, however,
' Everyone who is angry at his brother
Shall be liable to judgment :
Whoever addresses his brother, " Empty head,"
Shall be liable to the assembly :
Whoever addresses his brother, " Heretic,"
Shall be liable to fiery hell.'

Dr. Bowman uses the translation *collaborationists* for *publicans* or *tax-gatherers*, and *approval-seekers* for *hypocrites*.

The interpretations in this book are always interesting and thought-provoking. In dealing with the word *poor* Dr. Bowman writes : ' He (the poor man) became known as one who sensed, on the one hand, his dire need, and, on the other, the fact that this need could be met only on the spiritual plane and through the attainment of a right relationship with God.' He singles out the true sin in adultery : ' In love there is the acknowledgment of responsibility to match privilege involved in association with another ; in lust there is the desire only for privilege with no thought of assuming the responsibility to match it.' On the stern command to root out the member of the body, the hand, the eye, the foot, which is a stumbling-block he comments : ' Long before the discovery of the circulation of the blood, Judaism taught that a blemish in any part of man's personality might easily be communicated to every other part, and thus vitiate the whole.' This then is a warning to root out any evil before the whole personality is contaminated. On the whole question of the ethic of the Sermon on the Mount he quotes Dr. John Knox : ' Jesus was not trying to be practical, but to be true. He was not seeking to state what man can do, but what God asks.'

One notable feature of this book is its interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount in terms of poetry, and its use of the materials that Aramaic scholarship has supplied as an aid to interpretation. It is possible that Dr. Bowman has gone too far in this direction, and that he sees poetical arrangements, and intimate connexions, where there are none ; and that he overstresses the Aramaic background and neglects the Greek meaning of words.

This is one of the most stimulating volumes on the Sermon on the Mount that we have ever had the good fortune to encounter. We strongly commend it to every preacher and teacher and Bible student.

On p. 111 *whither* should be *wither* ; on p. 117 *epechein* (twice) should be *apechein* ; on p. 161 *Curatonian* should be *Curetonian*.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

KNOWING GOD

The question of God and of our knowledge of Him is central in theology—indeed, it *is* theology in the strictest sense. But, as John Baillie rightly says, this is ' the most difficult of all subjects.' This is a theme which demands not only scholarship but wisdom and experience as well. All of these qualities are to be found in Jean Daniélou's book, *God and Us* (Mowbray ; 22s. 6d. net), translated from the French by Walter Roberts.

The author's aim is to show the different ways of knowing God, and to establish an order among them. He begins with the knowledge of God outside of the Christian revelation—the God of the

religions, and the God of philosophy. Unlike Barth, he believes that this is a genuine knowledge of God. 'It is the same God who made Himself known to the heathen and to the philosophers, to the Jews and to the Christians.' But the knowledge given by this cosmic revelation is imperfect, and the human mind needs to be supported by a more positive revelation.

The remainder of the book is devoted to exploring the Biblical revelation of God. This is done with a wealth of scholarship, in which the author draws upon the Bible, the Fathers, and modern theologians of many shades of opinion. One of his best chapters consists of a careful exposition of four characteristics of God in the Old Testament —truth, justice, love and holiness. He passes on to the New Testament, which he interprets as an unfolding of the mystery of the Trinity, and then considers the knowledge of God in the sacramental life of the Church, and in the experience of the mystics.

Though the author is a staunchly Catholic theologian, there is little in this book which will not commend itself equally to Catholic and Protestant readers. Inevitably, however, there are some debatable points. Such, for instance, is the position assigned to the tradition of the Church. It is stated that 'the Church has infallible power to define, in the face of any errors of interpretation that may appear, the authentic content of revelation.' Another controversial issue concerns the sacraments. In this connexion it is said that 'baptism signifies *and effects* a new creation.'

It would, however, be ungracious to dwell on such points. What the reader, no matter his persuasion, will remember of this book is that it is shot through with reverence and that it presents the reality of God. It does not deal in abstract ideas of God, but brings us before the living and holy God, before the mystery of Him who is 'unknown, and yet well known.' 'Theology,' says the author, 'is inadequate if it does not end . . . in a living encounter with the living God.' And again: 'The true science of God is that which leads us to love God.' No one will read this book without being grateful for the experience.

For this reason, it is to be commended not only to the theologian, but also to the intelligent layman who desires to deepen his knowledge of God, and also to the intelligent seeker who is looking for a way into this supreme mystery.

JOHN MACQUARRIE

THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS

The commentary of Dr. C. Kingsley Barrett, *The Epistle to the Romans* (A. and C. Black; 26s. net) will be eagerly welcomed by all who have read his exposition of John and his earlier works. The new commentary belongs to a series, edited by Mr. Henry Chadwick, University Lecturer in Divinity, Cambridge, and described as 'Black's New Testament Commentaries.' The publishers' jacket explains that, although full attention is paid to textual, grammatical, critical, and theological points arising from the Greek text, 'the book has nevertheless been written for the use of those who know no language but English.' This recognition of reduced standards of ministerial efficiency is ominous, for the knowledge of English translations which cannot be checked by the original Greek must tend to debase current expositions of Scripture in the pulpit. Happily Dr. Barrett has not tied himself to the neglect of Greek, for about a hundred Greek words and phrases are introduced into his commentary, but the reader is assured that he may pass them over 'without losing the thread of a single sentence.' Dr. Barrett also supplies many notes on variants in the Greek text.

The commentary itself is of a very high standard indeed. It is a courageous attempt to elucidate Paul's meaning and is mainly doctrinal in character. Dr. Barrett's chief debt is to Luther, Calvin, and Karl Barth. He confesses that in large measure it is to Barth's commentary on Romans, and to those in Cambridge who introduced him to it, that he has remained and continued to be a Christian. This indebtedness perhaps accounts for the singular statement that Sanday and Headlam's commentary 'old as it is, is by no means out of date' and for the neglect of Denney, Lagrange, and Nygren. The commentary is one of the kind in which the author speaks mainly for himself with only occasional allusions to the views of others. This method makes for clarity of statement, but sometimes leads to obscurity. For example, the difficult section on the theme 'free from sin' in 6^{1-14} would be clearer if consideration had been given to the exposition of others. Some reference to C. L. Mitton's three articles in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (lxv. 78–81, 99–103, 132–135) would also illuminate Ro 7^{7-25}.

In this series the author supplies and comments upon his own English translation. This means that the translation is part of the commentary itself, and, except upon occasion, the commentator is spared the necessity of defending his departures from the Greek text or the familiar English versions. As one might expect, Dr. Barrett's rendering is able and interesting. Naturally there are cases where the reader will hesitate, for example, in 1^{4} in which Dr. Barrett's translation is 'appointed Son of God in power after his resurrection from the dead,' a rendering which is defended on the ground that Paul is using a

primitive formula. In 3^{25} ' This Christ Jesus God publicly set forth in his bloody sacrificial death as his means of dealing with sin,' is an improvement upon C. A. Anderson Scott's translation in ' Christianity according to St. Paul,' since Dr. Barrett recognizes that we can hardly doubt that expiation rather than propitiation is in St. Paul's mind. We also welcome the rendering of the following verse in which Dr. Barrett does justice to *πάρεσις*, ' passing over.'

Dr. Barrett repeatedly draws attention to the fundamentally eschatological cast of St. Paul's thought, but he preserves a true balance when he says that, while it remained true that Jesus would come in glory to judge the secrets of men (2^{16}), ' it was also true that Jesus had come, and that at least the firstfruits of the future were available to faith ' (8^{23}). The question arises whether this *present* activity of Christ is not St. Paul's distinctive emphasis, since a writer's characteristic interest is what he makes of his heritage. There is no doubt that the Apostle looks forward to the age to come ($14^{11f.}$) and that most of his terminology (justification, salvation, righteousness, etc.) is eschatological in origin, but the stress lies on what Christ does ' in this present time ' (3^{26}). When baptism and Christ's present work are described by Dr. Barrett as ' the firstfruits of the future ' the intention is not to speak of a shadowy forecast of ' the real thing,' but the phrase tends to leave this impression or at least to diminish the extent of the experience of the Christian *here and now*. The eschatological question is the most important issue raised by the commentary, but there are many other matters which ought to lead to further discussion. Among these may be mentioned the explanation of *δικαιοῦν* as meaning ' to make righteous,' not in the ethical sense of ' virtuous,' but rather of ' right,' ' clear,' ' acquitted ' ; the rendering ' we have ' in 5^{1} ; the explanation of ' the wrath of God ' as no automatic force, but ' God's personal reaction against sin ' ; the question whether the analogy of the potter is as weak and remote as it first appears to be. If the virtue of a commentary is to provoke thought, and so to lead to a deeper understanding of a Gospel or Epistle, this work stands out as an impressive and fruitful study of Pauline teaching concerning the righteousness of God (which is His saving activity), a truth which is of vital importance to-day as in all past Christian ages.

VINCENT TAYLOR

To the already extensive Livingstone bibliography a really important addition falls to be recorded—*Livingstone the Doctor: His Life and Travels*, by Michael Gelfand, O.B.E., M.D., F.R.C.P. (Blackwell ; 42s. net).

Only a medical man could have carried through the necessary research for this book ; but the subtitle ' A Study in Medical History ' must not obscure the fact that Dr. Gelfand has provided much more than a study of the great missionary's medical work. The book is really a life of Livingstone with the medical aspect given its due place, and it is at the same time a contribution to the history of Central Africa. It is surprising that such a book has not been written before, for Livingstone's medical training contributed not a little to his success with the natives and to all his career in a country infested with malaria. Moreover, he made some important medical observations. With bibliography, appendices, excellent illustrations and maps and a Foreword by the President of the British South Africa Company, which, we gather, has sponsored the publication, this is a notable volume.

Recently there has been a growing interest in the Eastern Orthodox Church, and *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, by Dr. Vladimir Lossky (James Clarke ; 16s. net), will further stimulate and widen that interest. It is a careful presentation of Eastern theology, expository rather than critical, sometimes unnecessarily dogmatic but not illiberal, encouraging freedom of discussion within the boundaries of certain (for the author) indispensable premisses.

A fundamental emphasis of the writer is upon the unity of theology and mysticism, and he smooths the way towards the solution of difficulties by his somewhat grim distinction between ' cataphatic ' and ' apophatic ' theology, which, being interpreted, would mean between positive and negative theology. His negations, however, do not result in the Nothingness often attributed to Buddhism, but in fullness of understanding and mystical experience. The Divine Darkness is eventually that in which the truth of the Trinity is disclosed, and the centrality of this source is further emphasised by the author's decisive rejection of the doctrine of the ' double procession ' of the Holy Spirit from both the Father and the Son. The origin of all religious experience is with the Father, and any apparent contradictions within Trinitarian doctrine are antinomies only for unbelief.

The whole range of theology is passed under review in this book in a masterly way, and many little known aspects of Eastern theology are elucidated. We come near to modern extra-theological thought in the comparison which the author suggests with Kant, who—as did also his followers—tended to push all difficulties into the realm of ' things-in-themselves,' and leave them there ; whereas Dr. Lossky would guide them into

the region of the 'Inexpressible,' in which the saints may discover that the fullness of the Godhead dwells.

An early chapter in the book is designated 'The Divine Darkness' and almost the last chapter has the title of 'The Divine Light'; and this sequence is symbolic of the hopeful, inspiring and devotional character of this book as a whole.

A few books in the enormous output of what is called 'devotional literature' have become classics of perennial interest. With a piety that combines sensitive literary appreciation, theological acumen, and a wholesome pastoral concern about modern religious thought and practice the Rev. Philip W. Lilley offers studies of nine such books and their authors in a volume called *Athletes of the Spirit* (Epworth Press; 10s. 6d. net). Anyone seeking for himself or proposing to give to some class an introduction to these works will find richly suggestive the way Mr. Lilley brings out their relevance to modern life. Most apt and illuminating, for example, is his judicious comparison of the methods of appeal and follow-up indicated in Wesley's 'Journal' and those of the Billy Graham mission. The appreciation of 'The Pilgrim's Progress' is delightful reading. To say that all of these studies are graceful and accomplished would not give an adequate impression of their value without adding that just where the chapters on Augustine and à Kempis and Pascal offer scope for profounder treatment, one becomes most aware of the scholarship and religious insight that pervade the whole book.

December last saw the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the birth of Charles Wesley, and to mark the occasion the Epworth Press published at 7s. 6d. *Fifty Hymns by Charles Wesley*, selected by the Rev. J. Alan Kay. The hymns and tunes are given as they appear in the 1933 hymn-book of British Methodism. The collection is preceded by a brief life of Charles Wesley by Dr. E. Benson Perkins. Other interesting additions are the Preface and Table of Contents of the 1780 Methodist hymn-book, together with John Wesley's instructions on singing. The selection must have been difficult to make, but we note that the chief favourites are here. Wesley's own headings are restored—for example, 'In Temptation' above 'Jesu, lover of my soul.'

Catchwords, Character and the Calendar, by Principal W. Gordon Robinson (Independent Press; 9s. 6d. net), consists of sixty short 'reflections,' as the author calls them, which appeared in 'The Daily Dispatch' before that paper ceased its independent existence. Starting from some familiar phrase, fact or date, the author contrives to introduce relevant Christian considerations, so providing a helpful message under each heading. He is in error, however, about the chief end of man. The Shorter Catechism says it is to glorify God and to enjoy Him for ever, not to enjoy God and glorify Him for ever.

Bishop Stephen Neill has permitted the publication of four lectures which he delivered at the London Missionary Society's Summer School in 1956. The titles were 'Why was Jesus Crucified?' 'God's Warfare,' 'Persecution in the New Testament' and 'Standing for the Truth'; and they appear now as *The Cross in the Church* (Independent Press; 4s. net). We commend them warmly, for they have a vital message for to-day, and that message is commended by the Bishop's personality and experience which shine through his words.

Messrs. Marshall, Morgan and Scott have done well to issue a new edition of Dr. Richard Glover's *Teacher's Commentary on the Gospel of St. Mark* (17s. 6d. net), for it reads as freshly to-day as when it was first written. It is still, in H. R. Mackintosh's words, 'a preacher's gold mine.' Here is an example from the thirteenth chapter where Dr. Glover finds six saving lessons to guard the disciples against—

1. Being deceived by false prophets (*v.* 6–8).
2. Breaking down in constancy (*v.* 9–13).
3. Being involved in the doom of the presumptuous (*v.* 14–17).
4. Thinking lightly of God's judgment (*v.* 18, 19).
5. Being unduly forgetful of God's protecting care (*v.* 20).
6. Being unwatchful (*v.* 21–end).

We welcome a volume of hitherto unpublished sermons by the late Bishop Hensley Henson. The title is *Theology and Life* (Mowbray; 10s. 6d. net). The sermons 'were preached in the ordinary course of the bishop's duties as he went about his diocese Sunday by Sunday.' In them he carried out the advice he gave to his clergy—not to neglect opportunities of teaching. 'In my judgment,' he said, 'by far the best instrument of teaching is exegesis.' His models were Chrysostom among the ancients, Leighton in the seventeenth century, and among the moderns Robertson of Brighton.

That creed and conduct cannot be sundered is a leading idea in the sermons. And in the sixth sermon, which gives the title to the volume, he develops the thought under two headings—(1) Doctrine draws with it conduct which is in harmony with itself, and (2) the test of sincerity in belief is the believer's conduct.

The Laodicean Lukewarmness

By M. J. S. Rudwick, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge, and the Reverend E. M. B. Green, M.A., Queens' College, Cambridge

In his study of *The Letters to the Seven Churches*, Sir William Ramsay argued that, at the time when the Apocalypse was written, each letter had been particularly appropriate to the Church to which it was addressed, and betrayed intimate knowledge of the local circumstances on the part of the author. These allusions, he maintained, had been used to depict the spiritual condition of the Churches concerned. Some have dismissed his interpretation as far-fetched, but on a recent visit to the sites of the seven cities it was felt that the majority of the geographical and historical allusions were plausible.

The appropriateness of Christ's offer to the Laodiceans (Rev 3^{18}) has been widely recognized. *Chrysion* (gold) is contrasted with the wealth of the city which spurned Imperial aid when devastated by an earthquake, and was notable in that she recovered in virtue of her own resources.[1] *Kollourion* (eyesalve) may well be an allusion to the famous medical school nearby at Men-Karou, where Phrygian Stone was used as an eyesalve. And *himatia leuka* (white garments) are contrasted with the cloaks of black wool, called *Laodicia*, for the manufacture of which the city was celebrated. Incidentally, the local breed of long-haired black sheep with glossy coats, which Ramsay thought was extinct, in fact survives, at least in small numbers; some were seen and photographed.

This article arises from some observations made around Laodicea. While pursuing Ramsay's approach, it seeks to shed some light on the meaning of the terms 'hot,' 'cold' and 'lukewarm,' for which, curiously enough, Ramsay offers no interpretation. Most other commentators, both patristic and modern, have taken 'lukewarmness' to denote a compromise between the fervent 'heat' of a believer, and the indifferent 'cold' of an unbeliever. Thus the *chliaros* (lukewarm man) is the Christian who lacks zeal. For example, Arethas describes him as the man who 'has participated in the Holy Spirit through baptism, but has quenched the Gift.'[2] Again, Gregory the Great explains *chliaros* as 'the man who has grown cool after his conversion; one cannot even have the hopes for him that one would entertain for a flagrant sinner.'[3] But this interpretation involves both (i) an exegetical difficulty, and (ii) a textual difficulty.

(i) It implies that even the apathy of a pagan is preferable in God's sight to the half-heartedness of a Christian, a doctrine that would be difficult to defend from other passages of Scripture. Moreover, the application of the adjectives 'hot' and 'cold' to spiritual temperature, though natural to us, appears to be almost entirely foreign to the Ancient World.

Zestos (hot) is normally applied to water, and figuratively to the passions of men, but there appears to be no example of its being applied to a person *tout simple* except here. The same holds good with the cognate verb *zeo* (boil or seethe). It is used of Apollos in Ac 18^{25}, and of Christians in general in Ro 12^{11}, apparently with the meaning 'fervent in spirit,' But the only other example of this usage seems to be *Etym. Magn.*, 413. 23. It says 'We call a man *zestos* when he is volatile and choleric.'[4]

The case is even more singular with *psychros* (cold). It is much more widely used in the metaphorical sense than *zestos*, but is extremely rarely applied to persons. 'Cold and melancholy' once in Aristotle,[5] and a purposely ambivalent usage once in Xenophon [6] are the only examples of the absolute use of the word to denote what we mean to-day by the characteristic 'cold.' In the New Testament it is not predicated of persons at all. This should warn us against assuming that the Ancients used the words 'hot' and 'cold' in the same metaphorical sense as we do.

Chliaros is, of course, a very rare Greek word, and a Biblical hapax. Indeed, this is the only place in Greek literature where it is applied absolutely to persons. Thus we see that the normal exegetical tradition is extremely tenuously based in the actual usage of the three words. And the very singular fact that all three words are here applied *both* metaphorically *and* absolutely to persons should lead us to expect to find the reason for this unparalleled procedure in the local situation which gave rise to the letter. It will be argued later that this is exactly what we have; but before we leave these three words, a glance through the Lexicon shows that they are all applied in their literal sense more commonly to

[1] *Revaluit propriis viribus.* Tacitus, *Annals*, xiv. 27.

[2] ὃς μετουσίας ἔλαβεν πνεύματος ἁγίου διὰ βαπτίσματος, ἔσβεσε δὲ τὸ χάρισμα.

[3] *Qui post conversionem tepuit, et spem quae esse potuit de peccatore subtraxit. Reg. Past.*, iii. 34.

[4] ζεστόν ἄνθρωπον φάμεν τὸν ἐυκίνητον καὶ θερμόν.

[5] ψυχροὶ καὶ μελαγχολικοί. Ar. M. M. 1203 b.1.

[6] Xen., *Cyr.*, VIII. iv. 22, 23.

water than to anything else. This may predispose us to expect some reference to water here, and indeed the allusion is rendered almost certain by the juxtaposition of *chliaros* and *emesai* (spue out) in Rev 3^{16}. For we learn from the *Vita Aesopi*[1] that warm water was used as an emetic.

(ii) The textual difficulty of the normal interpretation is as great as the exegetical. It would be natural to expect the text to read 'I would you were hot, or even cold,'[2] whereas, in fact, there is no 'even,' which means that 'hot' and 'cold' are to be taken as equally commendable alternatives. Moreover, on two out of the three occasions in this context where the words 'hot' and 'cold' are coupled together, 'cold' precedes 'hot,' as though it were the preferable condition! Indeed, it can hardly be denied that the author of our letter three times emphasizes that 'hot' and 'cold' are *equally commendable alternatives* to 'lukewarm' ($3^{15.\ 16}$). Any acceptable interpretation must take account of this point. And this is just where the traditional interpretation, derived from the later Fathers, falls down. We are unfortunate in that practically no Greek commentary on Revelation survives, but it is perhaps significant that Origen refers to this passage in the *De Principiis*,[3] and with his characteristic insight recognizes and accepts the equipollence of hot and cold. The lukewarmness, according to him, applies not to the lapsed Christian, but to the unregenerate man.

We have argued that the traditional interpretation of the passage finds little support in the known usage of the words concerned, and that it fails to account for the outstanding features of the text. We consider now the local circumstances of Laodicea, and their possible bearing upon the meaning of the passage.

Laodicea was built on a site which was chosen entirely for its position on an important road junction. It lacked a natural water supply, for there are no springs on the site, and the Lycus River dries up in summer. Evidently it had to obtain its water from some source lying to the south, for the terminal part of an aqueduct from that direction is still extant. It is not an open duct, but is in the unusual 'siphon' form. It consists of two stone pipes, which are badly choked with mineral matter similar to that deposited by the hot springs at Hierapolis a few miles away. Hot mineral springs are common in the neighbourhood, and the orientation of the aqueduct suggests that the springs at the modern town of Denizli, five miles to the south, were the source. Denizli means 'sea-like' (not, *pace* Ramsay, 'full of waters'), and this may well refer to its salty mineral springs. Indeed it is difficult to resist the conclusion that Laodicea, in the absence of any permanent source of more normal water in the area, was obliged to procure its water from these hot springs. If this was the case, the water would have cooled slowly in stone pipes, and even after having flowed several miles, would still be warm when it reached the city. If it should seem improbable that a city would ever tolerate a water supply that was lukewarm, it is worth remarking that to-day the villagers at Eçirli (Hierapolis) are in precisely the same predicament, and are reduced to the expedient of standing the water in jars until cold before using it for drinking. It is suggested, therefore, that the 'lukewarmness' of the Laodicean Church is an allusion to the unusual quality of the city's water supply.

It is likely that the terms 'hot' and 'cold' had comparable local significance. We have already noted that *zestos* and *psychros* are most commonly used of water. At Hierapolis the hot spring water was much prized for its healing properties, and the extensive and opulent remains of the city show the breadth of its popularity and appeal. The mineral matter deposited by the water as it falls to the valley floor has formed a series of terraces edged with spectacular white cascades. These white cliffs are a most conspicuous landmark for miles around, and are clearly visible from Laodicea. Hence the mention of *zestos* would probably have reminded a Laodicean of the curative waters of his city's nearest neighbour. Colossae, of course, less than ten miles away, had a perfectly good supply of cold water, and the adjective *psychros* may well refer to her. But no such specific allusion is requisite. For the greater part of the year this region is very hot and dry. In such a climate cold water is the most valued source of refreshment, and the very word *psychros* inevitably brings such associations to the mind of any one on the spot.

If this reconstruction of the local situation be correct, Laodicea would have been notorious as a city which, for all its prosperity, could provide neither the refreshment of cold water for the weary, as, for example, its neighbour Colossae could, nor the healing properties of hot water for the sick, as its neighbour Hierapolis could. Its lukewarm water was useless for either purpose, and only fit to be 'spewed out of the mouth.' The Church in Laodicea would have been intended

[1] *Vita Aesopi* I c. I. p. 230, 7; 18.

[2] For the traditional meaning the text should read thus: *ὄφελον ζεστὸς ἦς ἢ καὶ ψυχρός*. In fact, it reads *ὄφελον ψυχρὸς ἦς ἢ ζεστός*.

[3] Origen, *De Principiis*, III. iv. 3. See especially '*Tunc est quando nec calida nec frigida dicitur esse, sed in medio quodam tepore perdurans, tardam et satis difficilem conversionem poterit invenire.*'

to see in itself a similar uselessness. It was providing neither refreshment for the spiritually weary, nor healing for the spiritually sick. It was totally ineffective, and thus distasteful to its Lord. On this interpretation, then, the Church is not being informed of its spiritual *temperature*; rather it is being called to reflect on the barrenness of its *works*. The statement of its lukewarmness is followed by an analysis of the *cause* of its ineffectiveness (3^{17}: 'Because thou sayest. . . .'). It is self-satisfied, complacent and blind to its true state. But this self-deception, though culpable, is unconscious. There is no hint of deliberate compromise. It had not become indifferent because worldly interests had chilled its proper fervour, but it had become ineffective because, believing they were spiritually well-equipped, its members had closed their doors and left their real Provider outside.[1]

We conclude that 'hot' 'cold' and 'lukewarm' are to be understood as allusions to the local circumstances of Laodicea. The force of the imagery derives from the function and utility of hot, cold and lukewarm water. Hot water heals, cold water refreshes, but lukewarm water is useless for either purpose, and can serve only as an emetic. So the Church is charged not with half-heartedness but with ineffectiveness. Indeed, by its exclusion of Christ (3^{20}) it has virtually forfeited its right to the title of Church. For though formally identical, this letter is fundamentally different from the other six. Whereas their message is essentially didactic, the Laodicean is kerygmatic[2]; whereas the challenge to repentance in the others is admonitory ($2^{5.\ 16.\ 21.\ 22}$, 3^{3}), here it is promissory. Addressed to a Church, they must become what they are, through personal encounter with the Risen Christ.

This interpretation does not involve the postulate of an elaborate allegory, but merely suggests that the writer employed a straightforward imagery based on terms which, to the original recipients, were pregnantly allusive.

[1] The context does nothing to favour the suggestion of a Eucharistic reference in 3^{20}. The Church's serious condition had a cause far more radical than a failure to appreciate the Sacrament aright. Christ is depicted as being altogether outside the sphere of their existence. They constitute the anomaly of a Christless Church. The source of the imagery is again probably local. The city was set foursquare on one of the most important road junctions in Asia Minor, and each of the four city gates opened on to a busy trade route. The inhabitants must have been very familiar with the belated traveller who 'stood at the door and knocked' for admission. And in the East, the *deipnon* (supper) is, of course, the symbol of enduring friendship.

[2] It is not difficult to discern the familiar pattern of the kerygma in the appeal to faith in what Christ can afford (3^{18}), genuine repentance (3^{19}), and the voluntary acceptance of Christ into the whole being in the crisis of self-commitment (3^{20}).

Paul's Certainties

II. God's Purpose in Creation—Romans viii. 22–23

By the Reverend W. David Stacey, M.A., Eastbourne

'For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only so, but ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for our adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body.'—Ro 8^{22-23} (R.V.).

Paul would not have been the great man he was if he had not been certain of many things. Uncertainty may be commendable for its honesty and reserve, but doubters do not carry the gospel across continents or turn the world upside down. There are, however, many forms of certainty. Socrates, Paul, Napoleon, Brigham Young, were all certain in different ways about different things. We must begin, therefore, by marking out the field of Paul's certainty and defining its object.

Paul is not certain of himself, his own powers, his status in the Kingdom of God, or his place in glory.[1] In this series we shall not examine subjective feelings. We are concerned with the purpose of God known to St. Paul and to us in the realm of fact.[2] Paul's certainties are, or may be, universal. They may be apprehended by everybody. They were not revealed especially to himself. The οἴδαμεν γάρ of *v.* 22, as Sanday and Headlam point out, introduces a fact of common knowledge, though the apprehension of it may not have been as common as Paul assumed.[3] Moreover Paul's is an objective certainty. Much that goes under the name of religious certainty is personal. The validity of my professions for others depends upon their being able to see life from my point of

[1] 1 Co 9^{27}.

[2] C. H. Dodd, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans*, 139 f.

[3] *Romans* [*I.C.C.*], 208 f.

view. This is not so with Paul. The truths he knows are facts. They have no peculiar reference to himself. This is abundantly proved from the passage under consideration. God's purpose in Creation has significance for everybody. The fact that the whole creation groans in pain was not more important for Paul than for the Roman Christians to whom he wrote. It follows that this article will be more concerned with a series of facts, as they were understood by first century Christians, than with Paul himself.

Romans 8^{18-25} describes the present position of the Creation, the cause of all its contradictions, and the hope for its release. It will be convenient to consider these subjects in that order.

The present condition of Creation is bondage to futility. The meaning of *κτίσις* and *πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις* here is scarcely open to dispute. It means the whole created order—man, bird, beast, field, forest, everything, and this is the sense in which commentators from earliest times have understood it. 'The earliest exegesis of Ro $8^{19ff.}$ is quite in the spirit of the apocalyptic tradition in thinking of a creation-wide catastrophe,' writes Ethelbert Stauffer,[1] and he goes on to cite Irenaeus and Theodore of Mopsuestia as authorities. Recent commentaries by Karl Barth and Anders Nygren have followed the same line. 'It was not man alone, but the world in which he lives that was subjected to death. The ground is cursed because of him. The whole existence in which we are involved stands in bondage to corruption.'[2]

There has been an opposition, led by Adolf Schlatter. He understands the term *πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις* as a reference to the one 'homogeneous, closed circle' of mankind, and writes off, as 'highly excited fantasy,' the assumption of the majority that it refers to 'the whole world of being.'[3] No one acquainted with the apocalyptic and Rabbinic background of this subject can doubt that Schlatter cramps Paul's meaning. Verse 20 is surely an echo of Gn $3^{17f.}$ where the derangement of Nature followed the sin of Man. Later writers tended to magnify this notion, not to detract from it, and G. O. Griffith is probably much nearer to the mind of Paul when he describes the strife and contradiction that issued from the Fall as something more than 'global war.' 'It was a war on all fronts, terrestrial, celestial, infernal. Not only was man under oppression; Nature was in bondage also, and the whole creation awaited deliverance.'[4]

[1] *New Testament Theology* [tr. John Marsh], 271, n. 189.

[2] Nygren, *Commentary on Romans* [tr. Carl C. Rasmussen], 331.

[3] *Gottes Gerechtigkeit*, 274. [4] Gwilym O. Griffith, *St. Paul's Gospel to the Romans*, 95.

Paul uses two phrases to describe Nature's condition, 'subjected to vanity' and in 'the bondage of corruption.' *ματαιότης* carries the sense of futility, emptiness, folly. The purpose Nature once had, it now fails to fulfil. It misses the end that God ordained. It has lost its destiny. It makes no progress but revolves in painful and senseless contradiction. The result is strife and aimless imperfection. *φθορά* carries the thought still further. Nature is not without a destiny in its fallen state, but the destiny is dissolution and decay. There is a definite contrast with *δόξα* in *v.* 21. The created world that should have attained the 'freedom of glory' is now turned aside from its way and has sunk into the 'slavery of corruption.'

What was the cause of this disaster? It was not anything to do with the act of creation. Paul shared with his Jewish kinsmen the belief that Yahweh's work in Creation was flawless. He would have echoed the words of the Psalmist, 'O Lord, how manifold are thy works! in wisdom hast thou made them all.'[5] Indeed it was the fact that God's work was flawless that gave rise to this present problem. God created all things in wisdom, yet now there is something amiss. What happened and how will God redeem the situation? That is the problem of this passage. There can be no doubt that Paul attributed the disaster to a Fall of Nature much as he attributed the human tragedy to a Fall of Man, though the details are not at all clear. The phrase, 'not of its own will, but by reason of him who subjected it' is open to various interpretations. Who is the 'him' referred to here? Stauffer thinks man is indicated. 'The creation has been subjected to an inevitable doom not, like man, because of its own, but because of another's voluntary decision —because of man's decision, who is a free and responsible being.'[6] Bultmann,[7] rather unnecessarily, gives it up. 'Since it is unclear whom Paul means by the "subjector" (God? Satan? Adam?), we cannot understand this in detail.' Most commentators, however, take it as a reference to God Himself,[8] and this sense must be accepted for the verb requires some one who *actively* subjects Nature to bondage, which rules out man. These variations make little difference to the final sense. Man was ultimately responsible in that his sin brought upon the world the 'leaven of corruption

[5] Ps 104^{24}.

[6] *Op. cit.*, 74. See also Ramsay, *The Cities of St. Paul*, 13.

[7] *Theology of the New Testament* [tr. Kendrick Grobel], i. 230.

[8] Sanday and Headlam, *op. cit.*, 208. C. H. Dodd, *op. cit.*, 134. K. E. Kirk in the Clarendon Bible, 214. Griffith, *op. cit.*, 95, etc.

which infected all things.'[1] Theophilus of Antioch describes man dragging the animals into sin as the head of a house might involve his domestics in his own wicked affairs.[2] But God alone could take the necessary action. As we have seen, *v.* 20 recalls God's fiat of Gn 3^{17}.

Paul, then, regards the corruption of Creation as the result of a deliberate and historical curse, a conclusion that will not easily commend itself to our generation. Stauffer is not alone in vacillating, perhaps unconsciously, on this point.[3] It is quite natural to attribute the grandeur of Nature to God and its corruption to the powers of evil, and there may be Scriptural warrant for so doing. Paul elsewhere speaks of 'the world-rulers of this darkness' and 'the spiritual hosts of wickedness'[4] which suggests that he regarded the strife between good and evil as more than an earthly struggle. If this is so, if there was a heavenly Fall before an earthly one, then Creation and Man, as they appeared, were merely new battlegrounds in the great rebellion. If this truly reflects Paul's mind —and the way in which the Fall and redemption of Man and Nature are so closely tied together in our passage suggests that it does—then the phrase in Ro 8^{20} must be a momentary aberration.

In either case, Creation's catastrophe is not final. Everything, even in our sinful situation, will be brought under the yoke of goodness, turned to a good purpose, not indeed by automatic progress but by the redemptive act of God. This is the sense in which we are to understand the popularly misunderstood *v.* 28—'all things work together for good. . . .'[5] There is an element in our situation the common eye does not see, the unobtrusive yet ineluctable fulfilment by God of His will. The struggle is but temporary. God has determined there shall be universal deliverance.[6] The Cross of Christ is the reconciling power that will overcome the despotic forces that afflict Man and Nature in this age and, in due season, the new age of glory and freedom will appear. The Creation will be released from its bondage and all subordinate things will be restored to their primal and eternal duty and joy, the praise of God.[7] In offering glory to God, Man and Nature will find their glory (*δόξα* in *v.* 21). No details are given and none is needed. The rest is not silence, but eternal praise, for the whole *κόσμος* will be a temple of God.

The first scene in the final act of the cosmic drama has already been played, for Christ is already risen.[8] The universe waits, therefore, not passively, not resignedly, but in eager expectation. *ἀποκαραδοκία* (*v.* 19) is a highly expressive word implying the outstretched heads of a crowd on tiptoe, straining to catch the first glimpse of the Victor's chariot. So Creation struggles and strains to distinguish the first signs of Christ's appearing. In that great day, Man and Nature will, as always, be bound together, the one leading the other. For as Man led Nature into sin, so, in Paul's mind, Man's release will involve the whole created world (*v.* 19). *'The redemption of mankind is also to be the redemption of Creation.* For Paul the two go hand in hand and are inseparably united. Just as God, on the day of resurrection, will give man a body which corresponds to the new aeon of glory, a "spiritual body," so He will create a corresponding new cosmos, "new heavens and a new earth."'[9] The work of Christ is thus the final answer to the stress and struggle of the whole Creation. It groans and travails in pain until now, but the Great Day comes. And 'when the new man, the Son of God, is revealed at the end, then the whole Creation will have its "liberation day."'[10] So the travail of the world is transformed, and hope ousts pain.

So much for the facts set out in this passage. We must consider now what grounds Paul had for his certainty. Sanday and Headlam speak of the penetrating imagination of St. Paul that 'sees in the marks of imperfection on the face of nature, in the signs at once of high capacities and poor achievement, the visible and audible expression of a sense of something wanting that will one day be supplied.'[11] But penetrating imagination is not necessary. Common experience is enough to suggest to any thoughtful person that there is

[1] E. F. Scott, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, 51. See also Nygren, *op. cit.*, 21.

[2] *Ad Autol.*, ii. 17. See F. R. Tennant, *The Sources of the Doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin*, 281.

[3] Compare these two sentences from *New Testament Theology*. 'The curse of God lies on the fields where we work' (p. 70), and 'He can also see the growth of weeds, the enmity between man and beasts, the contrariness of the elements—and understand them all as secondary dislocations of the normal course of things, *as the work of the "enemy"* who has obtained power through the fall' (p. 73). (Italics mine.)

[4] Eph 6^{12}.

[5] C. H. Dodd, *op. cit.*, 138.

[6] Stauffer, *op. cit.*, 74 f., 226 f.

[7] The present condition of Creation is thus 'neither original nor final' (F. R. Tennant, *op. cit.*, 271). The work of Christ in redemption thus finishes the work of God in Creation (G. O. Griffith, *op. cit.*, 115, also C. H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks*, 106, n. 3).

[8] Bultmann, *op. cit.*, 347.

[9] Nygren, *op. cit.*, 332.

[10] Stauffer, *op. cit.*, 74.

[11] *Op. cit.*, 207.

something contradictory, inconsistent, baffling in the majesty of Creation on one hand and its corruption and pain on the other. It is not surprising that Paul sought a religious answer to this perennial question and not surprising that he found an eschatological answer.

He was doubtless helped on his way by the teaching of Judaism. For centuries the Jews had tried to find a solution to the problem in terms of 'the good time coming,' and, later, when their ideas on the Fall became clear, they found the cause of the problem there. Isaiah 11 is the most explicit of several passages propounding the solution. In the Messianic Kingdom the world of beasts will be renewed. They will no longer prey against man. Neither will they prey against each other. 'They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain.'[1] The regeneration of Man will thus be accompanied by the restoration of harmony to the Creation.[2] After the Exile the Jews began to consider, not only the cure of the disaster, but its cause. Adam's sin was soon linked with the sorrows of Creation and thereafter the cosmic disarrangements brought about through the sin of Adam were more and more emphasized.[3] 'As soon as the first man sinned everything became perverted and will no more return to order until Messiah comes.'[4] Apocalyptic and Rabbinic literature abounds in such references.

The place of man in the Christian revelation completes and confirms this belief for Paul. Man with Nature belongs to the world that is perishing. He is a part of the groaning Creation. Yet at the same time the Christian belongs to a new order created by Christ and sustained by the Spirit. The firstfruits of that new order are already his (*v.* 23). They constitute a 'guarantee' of the future glory.[5] This, for Paul, is the final proof. The new age, introduced by the resurrection of Christ and already bearing its fruit in the lives of Christians must be consummated and in its consummation restore, together with man, everything that shared in his Fall. Nature, then, may travail in hope, for man, to whom Nature is bound, already sees in the lives of his Christian brethren the sure signs of the glory that is to be.

[1] See also Is 65^{25}; Ezk 34^{25-28}; Hos 2^{18}; 1 En 45^{5}, $51^{4f.}$; Sib. Or. 3, 620–3, 744 ff., 788 ff.; II Baruch 29^{5}, 32^{6}, 57^{2}; IV. Ezra $11^{45f.}$, 7^{75}, $13^{26.\ 29}$.

[2] J. Skinner, *Isaiah* [Cambridge Bible], i. 106. See also W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, 37 f.

[3] Jubilees $3^{28f.}$; II Baruch 23^{4}; IV. Ezra 7^{11}; Apoc. Mos. 20. F. R. Tennant, *op. cit.*, 197, 238 f. H. St. J. Thackeray, *Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought*, 39 f.

[4] Bereschith Rabba, 12, 14. F. R. Tennant, *op. cit.*, 150 f.

[5] Bultmann, *op. cit.*, 155.

In conclusion let us try to assess the value of this passage. It is often disparaged. Marcion, for obvious reasons, omits it. In modern times Bultmann dismisses it as a piece of 'Gnostic mythology,'[6] and makes little attempt to penetrate the 'obscure words.' Often it is referred to as poetic vision and treated as an interesting but extravagant and unreliable flight of fancy. But those commentators understand it best who treat it most seriously, as a theological conception, all of a piece with Pauline doctrine and particularly with Pauline eschatology.[7] Elsewhere in the New Testament similar conceptions are found. The very fact that our Lord healed the sick suggests that He saw in some diseases a derangement of the Divine order that His Kingdom was to restore.[8] Misjudgment of this passage may arise from the belief that Paul was not given to cosmological speculation. Commentators have even distrusted it simply because it is cosmic in scale. In the Foreword to his book on Romans, G. O. Griffith gives a worthy reply. 'The eternal Christ in Whom we have our redemption is He through Whom the worlds were made, and redemption itself is on the cosmic scale. To lose sight of this and to detach the Pauline doctrines from their cosmic setting is, one must believe, to misinterpret them.'

Out of this interpretation springs a number of very suggestive theological ideas that can only be referred to in passing. Evil is seen on the grand scale. Sin and suffering are the various outworkings on earth of a supramundane disaster. Man, Nature, and even the Holy Spirit are united in travail until the day of deliverance comes. Man is the means of Nature's redemption even as his present position in Christ is the ground of Nature's hope. The Cross is no longer to be reckoned as the watershed of human history only. It becomes the focal point of all existence. Redemption, too, is seen on the grand scale. It was the good pleasure of the Father to reconcile all things unto Himself, to sum up all things in Christ, to release the Creation from its bondage to the glorious freedom of the children of God.

So Paul introduces us to a larger gospel on a grander scale with a nobler end. 'The antiphony of universal history leads into a symphonic doxology. At last God has attained the *telos* of His ways: the revelation of the *gloria dei* achieves its end in the hallowing of His name.'[9]

[6] *Op. cit.*, 174, 230.

[7] As, for example, H. A. A. Kennedy, *St. Paul's Conception of the Last Things*, 334 ff.

[8] See also Mt 9^{32}, Mk 4^{39}, Lk $10^{18f.}$ 11^{14-20} 13^{16}, Jn 12^{31}, 1 Jn $5^{18f.}$

[9] Stauffer, *op. cit.*, 231.

Contributions and Comments

Further 'Unknown Sayings of Jesus'

By way of footnote to the very interesting discussion of some *Agrapha* from Jeremias' *Unknown Sayings of Jesus* (The Expository Times, lxix. [January, 1958], 97 ff.), it may be observed that another collection of such *Agrapha* is now available, or soon will be. Among the documents of the Gnostic library of Nag Hammadi, discovered in 1945, is a text entitled *The Gospel of Thomas*, which Professor H. C. Puech has identified as nothing more or less than a complete collection of Logia, the beginning of which is identical with the Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 654.[1] In point of fact this document contains all the sayings of the three famous fragments found at Oxyrhynchus.

Unfortunately, the text is for the present likely to be quite inaccessible to most readers, in the first place because it is in Coptic and in the second because the only edition to date is a photographic edition published in Cairo. The passages corresponding to the Oxyrhynchus fragments are however given in a Latin translation in an article by G. Garitte,[2] to which reference may be made for further details. Garitte reports that an edition with an English translation is in preparation, and it has recently been announced that an edition with complete references and a full bibliography will be published in the course of 1958.[3]

Some Logia from this *Gospel of Thomas* were discussed by Professor Quispel of Utrecht in a paper read at the recent Oxford Congress on the Gospels,[4] from which it would appear that numerous problems await the interpreter. For example, some of these sayings are clearly parallel to Synoptic sayings, yet present striking variants. The familiar sayings about patches and wineskins, to take one instance, appear in the form :

They do not put old wine in a new wineskin, lest
this spoil it.
They do not sew an old patch on a new garment,
because a rent will come.

Here Professor Quispel suggests that we may 'conjecturally restore a fine piece of Semitic poetry, with the parallelism that is so characteristic of it, just by filling the gaps left in the Logion of "Thomas" with some fragments from our Gospels' :

They do not put new wine in old wineskins, lest
they tear, and they do not put old wine in a
new wineskin, lest this spoil it ;
they do not sew an old patch on a new garment
(because that agreeth not with the new)
(and they do not sew a new patch on an old
garment) because a rent will come.

In this case the canonical Gospels have preserved one member, the apocryphal tradition the other. It may be added that this suggestion might serve to explain the peculiar form of Lk 5^{36} (cf. Mt 9^{16}, Mk 2^{21}).

Again, at Lk 11^{40} the peculiar reading of the *Codex Bezae* and some other MSS ('did not he who made the inside make the outside also ?') finds some confirmation in the new Gospel. Here also Quispel suggests that 'a more primitive form ran somewhat like this :

He who made the inside also made the outside ;
He who made the outside also made the inside.'

Here, however, questions must be raised : Which is to be reckoned the more authentic—the complete parallelism thus restored, or the 'truncated' version of the canonical Gospels ? Have we in these passages cases of partial preservation of sayings in the canonical tradition, or of amplification and completion of the parallelism in the apocryphal texts ? Only careful study of the actual text will make it possible to reach a conclusion, and it may well be that there will be some difference of opinion on the subject. Thus it may be felt that in the two examples quoted there is a point to the canonical saying which is blunted when the parallelism is completed. It is accordingly to be hoped that the provision of an adequate edition of a seemingly very important text will not be long delayed. It will clearly be relevant not only to the early history of Christian literature but also to the development of the Gospel tradition, and as it would seem to the problems of the Diatessaron and the Western Text.

R. McL. Wilson

St. Mary's College,
St. Andrews

[1] See *The Jung Codex* (ed. F. L. Cross [1955]) 21 f. ; also in *Rev. Hist. Rel.*, cxlvii. [1955] 126 ff. Quispel (*Vigiliae Christianae*, xi. [1957] 202 n. 17) notes that J. H. A. Michelsen 'long ago observed the Oxyrhynchus "Sayings of Jesus" to be fragments of the Gospel of Thomas.' Cf. also the discussion in Grenfell and Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, iv. 1–22.

[2] *Le Muséon*, lxx. [1957] 59 ff.

[3] Quispel, *op. cit.*, 189 note ; according to Till (*BJRL*, xl. [1957] 252, note 6) this edition will be published by Brill of Leyden.

[4] Now published in *Vigiliae Christianae*, xi. [1957] 189 ff.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

The Real Value

By the Reverend Sydney F. Clark, B.D., Sheffield

'Ye are of more value.'—Mt 10^{31}.

How much money have you got in your pocket? Since we have not yet had the collection you probably have quite a lot. How much does it weigh? That doesn't matter, you say. But sometimes it does, even in money matters. It did nearly two hundred and fifty years ago in Sweden. In Sheffield City Museum they have just received one of the rare copper coins of those days—it is dated 1718—and it weighs six and three-quarter pounds. Now, who says weight doesn't count? It would if you had to carry that!

I suppose you'd need a truck if you went shopping with that sort of money. You would leave the truck outside in the road and then when the time came for paying for your purchase you would have to say to the tradesman, 'Excuse me a moment, but I've left my purse by the kerb.'

Not only does this coin weigh all that, but it is also ten inches square and nearly one-third of an inch thick. It is a four-daler piece and it is like that because in 1713 it was decided in Sweden to go back to an earlier custom of making money which contained its face value of metal. The daler was the unit specially invented for these coins and they were made fairly commonly in half-daler, one, two and three daler denominations. There were few four-daler coins made, and even fewer eight and sixteen daler pieces. That is why these coins are so weighty, because the face value is the real value, the amount of metal in them is equal to the worth of the coin.

Our coins have a face value. We do not try to put the amount of metal in them equal to their worth. Paper money is only paper money. It is worth what it is because the Government says it is worth that. When we first had paper money there was always a golden sovereign kept in reserve for every pound note and you could demand a sovereign for a paper note if you were so minded. But there is no longer the number of gold sovereigns kept against the issue of paper notes.

What are you worth? What is any person worth? Sometimes we want a very clever man for a special job and we say he is worth so much. Is he? Have you ever thought how much a person is worth?

The Bible is all about this—how much is a man worth? How can you tell? Is it on the outside? The Bible says it is not. 'The Lord seeth not as man seeth; for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart' (1 S 16^{7}).

Sometimes we judge other people by their face value, what they look like, their appearance, how they stand with others and so on. That is not their real value. Sometimes we judge them by what is in them—what they can do, their ability, their qualities. Neither of these values is the value God puts on them.

The Bible answer to the question of our real value is that every one of us is worth everything God has. When Jesus died on Calvary He did so because He set the real value on human life—He believed it was worth dying for. Paul puts the real value on human life when he says, 'The Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me' (Gal 2^{20}).

Mrs. Molly Moore

By Rita F. Snowden, Auckland, New Zealand

Are you a sleepy-head? Camdenhurst Street in East London was surely a street of sleepy-heads. Mrs. Molly Moore was sure of it. Winter mornings when it was dark and cold, and the sun rose late, were the worst. But there were other mornings when it was almost as hard to get everybody up and washed and dressed and off to work. Sometimes a late bed-time was to blame—sometimes a long, full day of work or play.

But although it was a street of sleepy-heads, they didn't bother about alarm clocks—they didn't need them: they depended on Mrs. Molly Moore. If any one needed a clock surely she was the one, for she rose earlier than any one. And, taking her little pea-shooter, she went out into the street. From house to house she made her way—doing what must have been one of the strangest jobs in London—pointing her loaded pea-shooter up towards each bedroom window of a sleepy-head.

She is an old lady now—just on sixty—with thirty useful years of mornings behind her. To get round, she once had to start with her little pea-shooter at the first window at three o'clock. For it took her all that time to go from window to window to wake up a hundred-and-twenty sleepy-heads.

(But now that has changed—and she is able to stay longer in bed herself—for she has now only one call to make. But old as she is she still

manages to keep her little pea-shooter in working trim.)

Sometimes the peas she used to shoot up at the windows from the street below would fall into window-boxes, or into odd little pieces of garden, and grow. Then the secret was out—everybody could tell where the sleepy-heads lived.

But worse than sleepy-heads, of course, are sleepy-minds and sleepy-hearts. There is a lot about them in the New Testament—and it takes more than a well-aimed pea-shooter to wake them up. Some of them are people who have grown too lazy to think—to love the Lord their God with their minds. Some of them have grown too lazy to love God with their whole hearts—and people about them.

And when anybody is asleep in those most important ways—in mind and heart—then it's a kindness to waken them up. For they will never be really happy in the world, or do any real service, till they are awake. That's why in Eph 5^{14} there is this pea-shooter text 'Wake up, O sleeper!'

If Mary, who loved Jesus, had been a sleepy-head—or more important, a sleepy-mind or sleepy-heart—she would never have been able to bring to the world the most exciting and glorious news—of the resurrection of Jesus. But she was awake early, before even the sun was up, to come to the tomb in the Garden, bringing her precious spices. The dew was still on the grass and the birds were only waking. But Mary's mind was awake and her heart was awake. So that when Jesus, risen from the dead, spoke to her and called her by name, 'Mary,' she was ready and eager both to listen to the wondrous news and to run off with all haste to tell others.

'Jesus is alive,' she said, 'He is alive!' And that is still the most wonderful news that any one can wake up to and tell to the world. It's a pity to miss the joy of it!

The Christian Year[1]

PASSION SUNDAY

The Price of People

BY THE REVEREND REGINALD O. WHITE, M.A., B.D., BIRKENHEAD

'And they covenanted . . . for thirty pieces of silver.'—Mt 26^{15}.

'Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold . . . but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot.'—1 P $1^{18.\ 19}$.

It is doubtless only the merest coincidence that the shape of the Christian Cross roughly resembles the outline of a pair of beam scales—the upright stanchion supporting a balanced cross-beam. But, accident or no, the similarity enshrines a truth: for there, as nowhere else in history, the souls of men were weighed in the balance, and their worth compared.

The ancient slave-market where buyers haggled over the purchase of their fellow-men has always seemed an offence to dignity and humanity. There is something inherently wrong about reducing the immortal soul to a commercial equivalent in cash—though that feeling in itself is due more to the message of the Cross than to any other factor.

So it is that few things in the story of Christ's Passion have caught the imagination of the world more than the miserable bargain Judas struck with the chief priests for thirty pieces of silver. It reduces his betrayal to the sordid and selfish selling of a friend. Surely Matthew means us to feel that, when he deliberately sets the deed of Judas alongside the generous gift of Mary in anointing Jesus' feet with spikenard.

It was of course the customary price of a slave, as the Book of Exodus and the parable of Zechariah make clear. Joseph was sold by his brethren for twenty pieces of silver, but of course the Midianites had still to make a profit on him! So they weighed the worth of Jesus—these priests and this disciple—at the price of a slave.

But do not blame Judas only. Caiaphas weighed Jesus, also, against the worth of his own position and pride, and valued Him less. Pilate weighed Jesus against the might and glory of Cæsar, and threw Jesus away. The crowd weighed Jesus against the violent, patriotic adventurer Barabbas, with blood upon his hands, and chose Barabbas. They all agreed with Judas in the value they set upon the Son of God. They weighed Him in their little selfish, materialist, worldly balances, and found Him wanting! They knew no better.

A seventeenth-century poet, Joseph Beaumont, makes the most fitting comment:

But thou, improvident Judas, since thou art
Resolved to sell a thing whose value is
Beyond the power of arithmetic art
To reckon up—proportionate thy price
In some more near degree; let thy demand
Make buyers, who this Christ is, understand.

Ask all the gold that rolls on Indus' shore,
Ask all the treasures of the Eastern Sea,
Ask all the earth's yet undiscovered ore,
Ask all the gems and pearls which purest be,
Ask Herod's 'chequer, ask the high priest's crown,
Ask Cæsar's mighty sceptre and his throne.

[1] The Sermon in 'The Paradoxes of our Ministry' Series appears under the Second Sunday after Easter.

Ask all the silver of the glistering stars,
Ask all the gold that flames in Phœbus' eyes,
Ask all the jewels of Aurora's tears,
Ask all the smiles and beauties of the skies,
Ask all that can by any thing be given,
Ask bliss, ask life, ask paradise, ask heaven.

—yet still you have not asked enough for Him who is the Prince of life, the Lord's Beloved, and the Saviour of the world.

Urge him no more with sense and reason; he
Resolves to traffic with the priests; for now
No other god but money he can see—
He nothing sees at all, and cares not how
He makes his bargain with them, so he may
Have but this wretched sum in ready pay.

'And Judas covenanted with them for thirty pieces of silver'—a bad bargain beside which Esau's trading of his birthright for a mess of pottage was just a silly miscalculation! Yet Jesus so often warns us against precisely that miscalculation, that confusion in our valuation of life's important elements. The Judas valuation of the comparative worth of things is not the strange exception, but the all-too-familiar rule with most of us.

But there's another, happier aspect of this pricing of souls at Calvary. Beside their valuation of Him is set His valuation of us. They held Him cheap: He counted us precious. Judas sold Him to the priests for thirty pieces of silver; Caiaphas, Herod, Pilate, the crowds, dismissed Him as worthless; but looking out at them with a Redeemer's eyes He held there is not a soul on earth but is worth a Christ's ransom. He set a price on their heads, and on ours, the price of His own pain. He weighed their souls, and ours, and found He wanted them.

This is not fanciful. He had so often underlined the point; you are of more value than many sparrows, although not a sparrow falls to the ground without your Father's knowledge. Man's needs, hunger, health took precedence over the holy Sabbath and the sacred law—for they are designed *for* man. Man's soul is worth more than all the world, and to gain the world's prizes by its loss is to achieve no profit. There is nothing a man can give in equal exchange for his soul—he is the most precious thing in reach.

And when the soul is imperilled, then in His eyes 'the redemption of their soul is precious.' The shepherd will seek the sheep until he find it, for its value's sake. The father watches for the son because he is dear to him. The Gospel attitude to sinners is not sentiment, but a Christlike *valuation* of people.

Christianity, we can never say too often, is a religion of redemption: Jesus is the world's *Redeemer*. One side of that truth is the wondrous and manifold freedom into which He brings us by His grace. The other side of redemption is the costliness of our salvation. He gave *His life* a ransom. That is the measure of His claim upon us. The price He placed upon our heads has made us His bondslaves for all time—for love's sake, and because He purchased us. The apostles draw out the implications of that purchase in very forthright ways.

1. We are not our own, but bought with a price, and must glorify God in our body and in our spirit which *are God's*. To take back our members, our possessions, our talents, our lives, from the service of Him who redeemed us is to deny the Lord who *bought us*.

2. Because we are His we are responsible to Him alone, and that too is part of our freedom. We are His servants, and must not be bondslaves to any mere man—neither cringing before their criticism, nor sensitive to their scorn, nor enslaved by their opinions. We are to do all things, not with eye-service, as men-pleasers, but as serving the Lord. And being His slaves, by right of purchase, we are sealed with His Spirit—though not the spirit of bondage; and branded with His sign, bearing in ourselves the marks of the Lord Jesus, in the scars of many a battle for Him. Such is the claim to which the redeemed heart joyfully surrenders.

3. 'He gave his life a ransom': that is also the measure of His care for us. The Spirit by which we are sealed is the Spirit of *promise*; the redemption of the soul is precious and *endureth for ever*. He has obtained *eternal* redemption for us. 'My Father gave them Me, and no man shall pluck them out of My hand . . . I will come again and receive you unto Myself.'

4. We are sealed unto the day of redemption, the redemption of the already purchased possession, and He will surely claim what He has purchased at such cost. In the language of the Apocalypse, the sealing of the Lord's own is a badge of protection of those whose safety the Lord will require at the hand of the enemy. There lies our surest security, our pledge of final salvation. We are His, and He cares for us, and He will not let us go.

How differently men value things. He who is priceless they sold for a song; we who were worthless He freely redeemed by a King-of-king's ransom. We are aghast at the value they dared to set upon Him: we are silenced and humbled at the infinite value He chose to set upon us. In the scales of the Cross all values are changed: we only know that by the price He paid we are gladly His, now and for ever.[1]

[1] This sermon has been abbreviated.—Editor.

PALM SUNDAY

The Coming of the King

BY THE REVEREND STUART W. McWILLIAM, M.A., S.T.M., ABERDEEN

'Behold, thy king cometh unto thee . . . lowly, and riding upon an ass.'—Zec 9[9].

Let us turn our thoughts once more to the story of Christ's entry into Jerusalem on Palm Sunday.

1. *How He Came.* And first note the simplicity of His coming. He did not come riding a magnificent war-horse and escorted by troops in shining armour. His steed was a little grey donkey, and His bodyguard a handful of ordinary men caught up in an occasion which they could not quite understand. There was no glory as the world reckons glory. Little wonder if at that moment the Roman authorities could see in this Man on the donkey no possible threat to their power. There was nothing to suggest that nineteen hundred years later, when the splendour of Rome had long since turned to dust, the shouts of Hosanna would still be echoing through the world and the Man on the donkey would rule the hearts of millions. Yet His entry into Jerusalem was a piece with the rest of our Lord's life. He came to reveal the life of God yet He spent thirty out of His thirty-three years in a humble village in an obscure province of the Roman Empire, and much of that time doing the work of a carpenter. He came to declare the truth of God to men but He spoke of weddings and funerals and baking and mending clothes, of the birds of the air and the lilies of the field and He spoke in a language that even the simplest could understand.

But this is still the quality which characterizes Christ's coming to each individual man or woman. He comes simply. He comes in the stories told by a mother to her children. He comes through the message of preachers, trying to catch and hold in words the wonder and the mystery of God's truth, men declaring the Love of God, yet knowing that they have not even learned to love another as they should. He comes through some passage of Scripture which perhaps long familiar suddenly becomes alive as the Word of God because in it and through it Christ has come to us. He comes in a morsel of bread and a sip of wine saying this is My body, this is My blood, and for so many of us it seems too simple. Well, if we feel that way we must glance back to the story of the Temptations, where we see Christ rejecting the temptation to win men by more spectacular methods.

2. *Why He Came.* He came to Jerusalem to offer Himself to men and for men. To offer Himself as Saviour and this is why He comes still. Does the world need to be saved? Are we quite happy about the state of the world? Some time ago I listened to a man speaking on television—about the new and revolutionary power which has been placed at the disposal of mankind by the physicists. And the editor of the programme at the end summed up by saying something like this. 'We have told you of the tremendous potentialities of this new power. It is quite likely that our children or at any rate their children will be able to reach the moon. Of course the counterpart of all this is that we now possess the power of self-annihilation. Surely it is time that men learned to get on with one another and to combine so that they may face whatever awaits them in their conquests of other worlds than this. In spite of all appearances,' he said, 'I believe we will.' Do you think we will? Do you think the facts of human behaviour even during the last fifty years warrant such optimism? The world needs saving and Christ comes as the Saviour of the world to break for ever the vicious circle of hatred, war, and revenge, of destruction and death. It is not too late. It is never too late, but the sands are running out. He comes to offer Himself to mankind, will mankind accept Him?

3. *The People to Whom He Came.* They were just the same kind of people as ourselves. There were wise and simple, rich and poor among them. There were business men and politicians and housewives and tradesmen amongst them. There were extroverts and introverts, and good-tempered people and bad-tempered people, honest and dishonest, thrifty and shiftless. It was a pretty average collection of men and women, which lined the streets that day as He rode into Jerusalem. One thing they had in common and that was that they were all people who somewhere in their lives had things of which they were ashamed or ought to be ashamed. Some of them were dissatisfied with themselves, some of them were too satisfied with themselves, but all were sinners, and it was to them He came as it is to sinners He still comes.

4. *The Welcome They Gave Him.* It was an emotional welcome. They waved palm branches before Him and cast down their cloaks that He might walk upon them. They shouted and cheered. There is no doubt about it these people were carried away by their enthusiasm. So far so good. There is a place for emotion in religion. In fact there can be no true religion without emotion. Religion is concerned with the whole of man and

that surely includes his emotions. Some one said no virtue is safe unless it is enthusiastic and of course he was right. I remember once preaching in a negro church in Harlem and when I was fairly launched on my sermon there came a heartfelt Amen from one member of the congregation. I confess that I was thrown completely out of my stride, but as I went on I became slightly more accustomed to such interruptions and they did at least indicate whether people were for me or against me. Emotion is part of all the deepest human experiences of life. And so it must be part of religion. But religion must not be identified with emotion. These people gave Christ an emotional welcome, but they did not welcome Him with their wills. And at the deepest level religion is concerned with our wills. Christ has no place for the people who cry ' Lord, Lord ' and do not the things which He commands them. People whose lives are ruled by their emotions are unstable, and usually cruel. They make bad parents, bad husbands or wives, and bad friends. For they are as easily moved to hatred as to love, as easily moved to cruelty as to kindness. Religion cannot be founded on emotion ; it must be founded on our wills. It is comparatively easy to be moved emotionally by the experience of joining the Church and taking one's vows in the presence of a crowded congregation, but the real test comes later when one has to put these vows into practice in the world outside. Then you find that the Christian life is a costly and a sacrificial thing. It is easy to pray when you feel like it but God is not to be made dependent upon our feelings. It is easy to go to church when you feel like it but our service of the church must not rest upon our feelings. It is easy to feel that the Church is wonderful in the first flush of Christian discipleship but one soon discovers that it is composed of all sorts of people, some of whom are bound to rub us the wrong way and yet we have got to love them because, probably, we are just as unlovable as any of them and Christ loves us all. And we love them not emotionally but deliberately.

These people welcomed Christ emotionally but they did not submit their wills to Him and so in the end they crucified Him.

He comes simply. He comes to offer Himself as Saviour. He comes to sinners. We must welcome with our wills as with our hearts. Even so, come Lord Jesus.

the King
Will bind thee by such vows, as is a shame
A man should not be bound by, yet the which
No man can keep ; but so thou dread to swear
Pass not beneath this gateway, but abide
Without, among the cattle of the field.

Easter Day

After Three Days

By Principal J. Ithel Jones, M.A., B.D., Cardiff

' And after three days rise again.'—Mk 8^{31}.

If I were asked to name the darkest hour in the history of the world, I could do so without hesitation. I would pass by the Flood and the Assyrian and Babylonian conquests and the sack of Rome and the Dark Ages and the fall of France. Dark as all these were, none was as dark as those three days when Jesus of Nazareth lay in Joseph's tomb.

The burial of Christ was the culminating point in the victory of the forces of evil. Those eyes whose glance had brought peace to many were closed in death. The hands which had healed with a touch were crossed on His breast. The triumph of His enemies was complete.

For a long time they had been tracking Him down. They achieved a progressive narrowing of His movements. After the sordid plotting they got Him within the confines of a garden where the foul betrayal took place. His movement was narrowed still further when they hounded Him to the Praetorium. But even this was not enough. They must confine Him still further. So they nail Him to a tree. He is now completely pinned down. All He can do is move His head. Even there, of course, He is under the broad sky. So, when He has given up the ghost and His body is taken down and laid in a borrowed grave, the soldiers set a seal. They have Him now in an earthy cavity of a few cubic feet. They are happy. Their victory is complete. God is irrevocably beaten. Such is the verdict of the silent tomb.

And during the three days that followed there was nothing to contradict that verdict. The silence in Joseph's garden and the chilly stillness of the tomb are eloquent witnesses to the finality of evil's triumph and the overthrow of God.

But on the morning of the third day something happened to change the complexion of things. When the women arrived early at the grave they found it empty and were told, ' He is not here. He is risen, even as He said.' In the light of Sunday morning, Friday and Saturday look very different. The rising of Christ on the morning of the third day has something quite emphatic to say about the overthrow of God and the triumph of evil. What do we learn ?

1. That the triumph of evil is short-lived.

Only three days ! Even less than that. The Jewish way of counting days may have resulted in a little confusion in our thinking. The chronology of the events over the passion and crucifixion of our Lord is a little uncertain when we compare

the Synoptics with the Fourth Gospel. But it looks as if we are reasonably right in assuming, as we do in the timing of the celebration of these events, that our Lord was buried on the eve of the sixth day (Good Friday) and rose on the morning of the first day (our Sunday). This means that He was in the grave only thirty-six to thirty-eight hours at most. And their victory had seemed so final!

Does not the Apostles' Creed make this point perfectly? 'Suffered under Pontius Pilate, Was crucified, dead and buried.' Repeat those last three verbs, twice, three times. Let their eloquent staccato bring home the sense of absolute finality the enemies of Christ experienced when they saw Him expire and the seal fixed to the tomb. 'On the third day,' the Creed resumes the story, beginning a new sentence blandly, almost casually. Poor fools! Within a day-and-a-half of their heaving a sigh of satisfaction their foul dream was shattered.

> Vain the stone, the watch, the seal;
> Christ has burst the gates of hell:
> Death in vain forbids His rise;
> Christ has opened Paradise.

They sealed the stone, but only for thirty-six hours. The triumph of evil is pathetically short-lived.

But the resurrection of Christ goes even further than that. It tells us that.

2. Even the short-lived triumph of evil is completely illusory.

The point we have made so far is that the powers of evil triumphed for only thirty-six hours. We must now go a step further and say, 'not even for thirty-six hours!'

What happened to Christ during the thirty-six hours when His body was in the grave? This is dangerous ground and we must tread carefully. The Apostles' Creed affirms that He 'Suffered under Pontius Pilate, Was crucified, dead, and buried'; and that on 'The third day He rose again.' In between these two assertions the Creed says, 'He descended into hell.' 'Hell' here, of course, stands for Hades or Sheol, the abode of the dead, the place of departed spirits. And so the claim is that while His body was in the grave, Christ was busy in the realm of the departed.

What could He have been doing there? There is only one passage which even seems to throw any light on this question. The text of that passage is notoriously doubtful. It is the passage in 1 Peter which says He was 'put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison.' While, textually, doubt may be cast on this verse, there is the assertion in the Creed, just quoted, and the highly significant reference in Ephesians to Ps 68, 'When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive,' which, to many, points to a belief that the acts of redemption accomplished by our Lord included a release of those bound in the bonds of death.

It is not remarkable, then, that there should be this tradition that during those fateful thirty-six hours Christ was preaching the gospel in another realm. Some hold that He was taking the good news to the faithful departed; others that He preached to the faithless who had died in their sin. The settling of that nice question is of little importance for our immediate point, which is that while silence brooded in the Garden, Christ was busy as ever carrying on in another realm the work which His enemies thought they had cut short.

'God is overthrown and evil triumphs—but only until the morning of the third day,' we are tempted to say. No! Not even until the morning of the third day. Easter morning says that even the apparent short-lived triumph of evil is not a triumph at all.

It is a great message for days like these. We live in times when there seems a possibility of civilization tottering and finally collapsing. They have been called a 'long-drawn-out Easter Saturday.' The word for our age is not that God will one day come out on top, but that now, even now, in this time of apparent failing of His plans He is working His gracious purpose out as year succeeds to year.

Low Sunday

God's Balance of Power

By the Reverend D. H. C. Read, D.D., New York

'Then he said, Who shall order the battle? And he answered, Thou.'—1 K 20^{14}.

The art of statesmanship has always been concerned with what historians and diplomats refer to as 'the balance of power.' When Russia ships arms to Syria, when Tito breaks with Moscow or is reconciled, when a new missile is hurled into outer space, why do the alarm-bells ring in the State Departments and Foreign Offices round the globe? Because each time the balance of power is affected, and new calculations, assessments and readjustments of policy can be heard rumbling in the councils of the nations. When in our services of worship we pray for heads of Government and those in authority, we are not simply making a passing gesture of respect: we are upholding, in the best way open to us, the men who have the lonely task of steering us in peace and honour through these dangerous seas.

But there is something else that happens in Church. We come to worship God and to hear what He is saying to His turbulent human family. If we are Christians we should have eyes that see beyond the headlines, ears attuned to other sounds than radio-bulletins, and minds responsive to a universe where the balance of power has a wider reference and a profounder meaning. In other words we are concerned with the struggle that lies behind all human tensions—international, racial, social, domestic or personal—the balance of power between good and evil.

These are simple and old-fashioned words. Good and evil, what are we doing with them to-day? Some seventy years ago Nietzsche wrote a book called *Beyond Good and Evil* and depicted the Superman who reached to heights beyond ordinary morality. It sometimes seems as though moderns were indeed living 'beyond good and evil'—yet not as Superman striding on to new heights, but as Infra-man, the man who doesn't care about good and evil. This is the man for whom nothing counts but comfort and success, the man who claims to live with both feet on the ground. In his drab world value-judgments have been ironed out—'good' means 'I like it' and 'evil' 'there is nothing in it for me.' This is Infra-man. Poor Nietzsche! His Superman has ceased to reach for the stars and has become the hero of a comic-strip.

The real dignity of man in every age has depended on his recognition of the strength between good and evil and his involvement in it. To the so-called realist who says 'Don't let us prattle about morality, about good and evil, all that matters is preserving our way of life against any threat' we must say: 'What *is* our way of life? If it has nothing to do with the good, the true, the holy, and is simply concerned with an abundance of *things*, and temporary satisfactions, then is it worth preserving?' That is why we find thoughtful men and women to-day who are not afraid to say that behind all political struggles and international conflict a more decisive fundamental battle is being constantly waged—between the forces of good and the forces of evil for possession of the human soul.

The books we call the Bible are all concerned with this battle between good and evil—not in theory but in the clash and conflict among nations and families of men. That is why we find ourselves in Holy Scripture: this is *our* life. But every book, and every page, breathes the presence of a God who is Himself an Actor in the human struggle. And how does He act? As the sovereign God who controls the universe from the hair of your head to the farthest star. But also as the God who patiently and quietly, with infinite love and mystery *offers* His goodness to His children. And where in the Bible do we find the climax of the struggle? Not in a dramatic display of divine goodness annihilating the evil and purging the world of sin. No; we hear instead the cry of a helpless Child in a stable—the divine goodness surrendered into the hands of evil men. We hear the sounds of nails being driven through the hands through which goodness flowed, and the cry of anguish as the One of whom it was said 'He went about doing good' was plunged into the darkness where the curse of evil blankets the face of God. And this is the strange victory of the Son of God. For 'on the third day he rose again from the dead; he ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty.' Jesus Christ, incarnate, crucified, risen—and now we know that this goodness, this perfect love, is there victorious at the living centre of all power.

So for the Christian, in one sense, 'the strife is o'er, the battle done.' We believe that evil has done its worst, and Jesus Christ is Lord. Nothing that happens in the world outside, no strength of evil, or of suffering that takes arms against us can make us quail if we believe this. We know, or ought to know, that the spirit of Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit, is alive and that deep within there is a voice of victory.

All right—but how does it work? That is the question we are asked. Are we like men who have inside information as to the winner of a race confidently waiting while our fellows lose their money? When I commit my life to Christ do I then sit back to see how God is going to win out?

Hear the word of God—coming to us this time through a story from the wars of Israel.

Here is a man in a desperate situation—Ahab, King of Israel, facing an overwhelming opponent, Ben-hadad, King of Syria. (Some one had clearly been shipping arms into Syria.) The first demand came to Ahab. He tries appeasement. Then the screw is turned tighter. And Ahab reaches the sticking point. Then comes the word that means more than any other to a man in distress, the word we wait for when the enemy comes in like a flood, the word that most of us come to church to hear—the word of God that promises victory. 'And, behold, there came a prophet unto Ahab king of Israel, saying, Thus saith the Lord, Hast thou seen all this great multitude? behold, I will deliver it into thine hand this day; and thou shalt know that I am the Lord.'

Now here is Ahab in just the position where we often find ourselves in the battle between good and evil. Evil looks strong and all-embracing but somehow we know goodness is going to win. But how? 'By whom?' says Ahab. 'Who shall order the battle? And he answered Thou.'

This is the word God speaks to every one of us

who is enlisted in the battle against evil. God's balance of power is not exerted by some inscrutable force beyond ourselves, some law of progress by which the good is made to triumph, some rescuing angel who appears in answer to our prayers. Just as His goodness became flesh and dwelt among us, incarnated in a man ; so to-day it is through man He chooses still to work.

There were evils abroad like roaring lions in the sixteenth century and the monk Martin Luther was horrified at their strength. When he read the New Testament he heard afresh how Christ had fought and conquered, and laboured long to find how that grace and power could again be released to cleanse and invigorate the Church. ' Who shall order the battle ? ' he cried as he looked for help on every side. And in the silence of his cell he heard the only answer : ' Thou ! '

We are not Luthers. No, but if we are concerned anywhere along the line with the battle of good and evil the call is for us. Are we concerned, for instance, with the evils that threaten the rising generation, with religious illiteracy, temptation to over-indulgence, juvenile delinquency ? Do we say : ' Who shall order the battle ?—the churches, the schools, the State authorities ? ' The answer may well be ' Thou ! Go and offer to teach in the Sunday School.'

God's cleansing power will only flow out upon our world as we begin to hear again His call to serve. We spend enough time analyzing and deploring the evils around us. The Church ought not to be a place where we hear the sighs of the righteous crying : ' Who shall order the battle ? ' or the tramping feet of those who are marking time till the Kingdom of God shall come. It is a place where the victorious Christ through the agony of the Cross says simply ' Thou '—and we answer : ' Lord, here am I ; send me.'

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EASTER

The Paradoxes of our Ministry

VI. 'As poor, yet making many rich.'

BY THE REVEREND DOUGLAS STEWART, M.A., LONDON

1. It is taken as axiomatic in our society that poverty is bad and that wealth is good. True, one of the great negative prophets of the nineteenth century was Karl Marx, and Marx denounced the rich in a capitalist society. He enunciated the paradox of an uncontrolled capitalism, ' As rich, yet making many poor.' He unmasked the fundamental insecurity of a society which, by creating a vast under-privileged proletariat, forges the weapon for its own destruction.

But Marx is at best a negative, a secular, prophet. He never goes to the root of the matter, nor questions the foundation upon which society is built. He is concerned with the unjust distribution of wealth, but he never questions wealth as the foundation of human relationships.

In this respect Marx is followed by both political parties. Every one, whether on the left or on the right, assumes that wealth is good and poverty is evil, and therefore each side is passionately concerned as to who shall possess it. There is a blindness to the Gospel paradox ' as poor, yet making many rich.' There is a blindness to the Gospel parables, Dives and Lazarus, and the Rich Fool.

I once attended church on a Sunday when the Gospel for the day happened to contain the story of the rich young ruler. The vicar in his sermon took occasion to put us right about that story. He emphasized first that Jesus said this to a particular man and that, therefore, no general inferences were to be drawn and none of us need worry too much about our possessions. He went on to assure us that, in his experience, many people were greatly improved by an access of wealth, developing a new sense of responsibility, and taking a place in the community for which, beforehand, they might have seemed ill-equipped. ' Sell all that thou hast ' drifted further and further down the horizon as the sermon proceeded.

And yet, even on the secular plane, must we not pause occasionally to question the ultimate destination of a society driven by such a superficial scale of values ? Virginia Woolf has a passage in one of her critical essays in which she expresses both her admiration for, and her disappointment with, three of her eminent contemporaries, John Galsworthy, Arnold Bennett and H. G. Wells. Her admiration is for their technical skill. Her disappointment is with their vision of life. ' They spend immense skill and immense industry in making the trivial and the transitory appear the true and the enduring.' And she says of the characters in their novels ' The destiny to which they travel so luxuriously becomes more and more unquestionably an eternity of bliss spent in the very best hotel in Brighton.'

Can the destiny of man be expressed in terms of riches without denying the nature of man ? On a more popular level E. Arnot Robertson has condemned the American film. She says that, without disguise, the underlying theme is the success story. Isn't it true that the veneration of success has become a mass emotional philosophy in our time and isn't it further true that that success is seen less and less in human quality and more and more in extraneous possessions ? Is not this the root problem underlying our political restlessness, our

economic uncertainty, and our psychological maladjustment? We fear poverty, and the vicar's observation of greater responsibility would in New Testament terms be described as greater anxiety.

One other secular criticism should be mentioned. Mr. Aldous Huxley has given us, in *Ape and Essence*, a kind of cosmic Marxism; the revolution, not of a proletariat but of Nature itself against man. And with every advance in nuclear knowledge his criticism becomes more apposite to our situation. The Arch-Vicar of Belial, living after the gap in history caused by a vast atomic explosion, looks back upon our time and comments, 'These wretched slaves of wheels and ledgers began to congratulate themselves in being the Conquerors of Nature. Conquerors of Nature, indeed! In actual fact, of course, they had merely upset the equilibrium of Nature and were about to suffer the consequences. Just consider what they were up to during the century and a half before the Atomic explosion. Fouling the rivers, killing off the wild animals, destroying the forests, washing the top-soil into the sea, burning up an ocean of petroleum, squandering the minerals it had taken the whole of geological time to deposit. An orgy of criminal imbecility. And they called it Progress.'

'As rich, yet making many poor.'

2. 'As poor, yet making many rich.' Who has enriched the world?

All riches are spiritual. Riches consist in the immense variety of spiritual vision. The gradual enrichment of mankind which is the essential theme of progress in historical time lies in the accumulation of spiritual goods for the enjoyment of men. Artist, poet, singer, philosopher, scientist, and saint—these are the only rich men and in being rich they enrich humanity.

It is a saying of infinite extent that spiritual things are spiritually discerned and the appalling poverty of our time is the poverty of discernment. Men starve in the midst of plenty. They starve shut in upon themselves and unable to assimilate the wealth of beauty and truth available to them They starve while madly struggling for a material good which is fundamentally unsatisfying. The diet offered popularly is sawdust. It cannot be spiritually assimilated, and the lust for it so obsesses us that we cannot turn to our true nourishment.

The irony of this is demonstrated in the common tragedy of a man working so hard to ensure that his children have 'every opportunity in life' that he has neither the time, nor the energy to give his children what they need most and want most deeply, his love and companionship.

'As poor, yet making many rich.' The Christian paradox is based upon the historic fact of Christ. Here we have a child born in poverty and a man dying in poverty. At the end He has one garment for which the soldiers gamble and a friend to whom He commits the care of His mother. And all mankind has drawn upon 'the unsearchable riches of Christ' now for two thousand years. His riches flow to the Indian peasant and the African bushman, to the refugee and to the sick and broken in every land. His riches enrich those who remain ignorant of Him and those who deny His significance and even His existence. He has opened a fountain of living water at which all humanity slakes its spiritual thirst.

Then why are we so afraid of the Christian exaltation of poverty? Why are we so unable, in Christ's name, to assault the materialist assumption of our time? Why do we shrink from saying to any one, 'Sell all that thou hast'? Our civilization approximates more and more to the Church in Laodicea. 'Thou sayest, I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing; and knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked.' Christ stands without. 'Behold, I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me.'

Entre Nous

Incredible Industry

Goldsmith wrote of the village schoolmaster:

And still they gaz'd, and still the wonder grew,
That one small head could carry all he knew.

True as that may have been of Goldsmith's schoolmaster, it is truer yet of that extraordinary figure, Sabine Baring-Gould. Baring-Gould's story has been told in the most charming and scholarly way by the Rev. W. E. Purcell in *Onward Christian Soldier: A Life of Sabine Baring-Gould* (Longmans; 21s. net), with an introduction by John Betjeman.

The most extraordinary thing about Sabine Baring-Gould was his literary fertility. He wrote

somewhere around one hundred and thirty books; and they were books of all kinds. In the same year, 1865, he published one book on the Post-Mediæval Preachers, and another on Were-Wolves; at other times he produced biographies of Julius Cæsar and of the Rajahs of Sarawak; he wrote scholarly tomes on 'The Origin and Development of Religious Belief' and on 'The History of the Holy Eucharist in the First Three Centuries,' and he kept up a hail of popularizing books such as 'Lives of Old Testament Characters,' 'The Mystery of Suffering' and 'The Seven Last Words'; he was the author of thirty novels, averaging a hundred and seventy thousand words each, and of the famous sixteen volume 'Lives of the Saints'; to add to all this he was a pioneer archaeologist and a collector of the songs and ballads of the West Country. He always wrote standing at a high desk, and with unfailing regularity produced a chapter a day. Oddly enough he never received any ecclesiastical advancement. He was first in Horbury, then in Mersee, and finally for forty-three years in Lew Trenchard, of which he was at one and the same time parson and squire.

The astonishing thing is that as a boy he spent most of his time wandering about Europe with his parents in their coach, and had only three years' regular schooling; it is further to be noted that his father sternly forbade him to memorize anything, holding that memorizing destroys originality, a fact which may well account for Baring-Gould's encyclopædic, but often chaotic, and sometimes inaccurate erudition. And yet there can be few undergraduates who have arrived at Cambridge already familiar with six different languages.

He began his work in the church at Horbury, a north country industrial village where he had to begin the formation of a church. He had original methods: 'A choir has been formed and singing is remarkably good. The way in which it was collected is curious. Boys from the first took to making noises about the house, pelting the windows with mud and discharging volleys of old boots and shoes at the heads of those who attended the services. I had then to rush out of the back door, make a circuit of the house, come in the rear of the delinquents, seize on the chief offender, drag him into the house, and turn him then and there into a chorister.'

It was in Horbury that he married, and an amazing marriage it was. He the aristocrat fell in love with Grace Taylor, a sixteen-year-old mill-worker in Poppleton's Mill. His love was returned. She was sent to York for two years to be taught and trained for her new way of life. Then Baring-Gould married her, and it was one of the world's ideal marriages. She bore him sixteen children, and in Lew Trenchard was the sweet and gracious lady of the manor whom all loved.

It was also in Horbury that his three greatest hymns were written—'On the Resurrection Morning', 'Now the day is over', and 'Onward Christian Soldiers'. Let him tell his own story of how the last was written: 'The hymn, "Onward, Christian Soldiers" was written on Whitsun Eve, 1865. It had been resolved that the (Horbury) Brig children should come up to the Parish Church on Whitsun Tuesday; and Mr. Fred Knowles came to me at the Vicarage and asked what they were to sing on the long walk. We discussed one thing and then another and I said I would write a processional. "You must be sharp about it," said Mr. Knowles, "for this is Saturday and there will shortly be no printing done." So I set to work and knocked off the hymn in about ten minutes. We got it printed, and practised on Sunday afternoon at School and it was sung to a tune by Haydn on the Tuesday. I sent it to the *Church Times* and it was therein printed and published.' That is the author's own story; and yet the mystery remains that the hymn in fact appeared in the *Church Times of 15th October*, 1864! The mystery of the dates has never been solved.

Sabine Baring-Gould's hymn has sung and marched its way round the world; but that is not the only tune which Baring-Gould sent singing on its way. Perhaps his greatest work was the compilation of 'Songs and Ballads of the West', the words and music of which he took down from the old singers who were fast disappearing. He journeyed all over the West to collect these folk songs; and one of them is 'Widdecombe Fair' with 'Uncle Tom Cobley and all.' There may come a time when none will recognize the name of Sabine Baring-Gould, but it is difficult to envisage a time when the hymns he wrote and the ballads he rescued will not be sung.

We are grateful to Mr. Purcell for so charmingly rescuing the story of an extraordinary character. The charm of Baring-Gould is that in spite of his vast erudition he was never a professional scholar, but always an amateur in the real sense of the term. That is why he produced so much—and that is also why so little of what he produced has lasted.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.